

Library of the Theological Seminary,
PRINCETON, N. J.

Presented by Mr. Samuel Agnew of Philadelphia, Pa.

COLLECTION OF PURITAN AND
ENGLISH THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE



LIBRARY OF THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

SCB
11318

0-4-0



A
VINDICATION
OF THE AUTHORITY,
CONSTITUTION, AND LAWS
OF THE CHURCH AND STATE
OF SCOTLAND.

IN FOUR CONFERENCES.

Wherein the Answer to the Dialogues betwixt
the Conformist and the Non-con-
formist, is examined.

By GILBERT BURNET, Professor
of Theology in Glasgow.
from 1668 to 1674.



GLASGOW,
By ROBERT SANDERS, Printer
to the City, and University.

M. D. C. LXXIII.

NOTIFICATION

OF THE 11th DAY OF MAY 1864

TO THE HONORABLE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

AND TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

IN SENATE, MAY 11, 1864

REPORT OF THE COMMISSIONER OF THE GENERAL LAND OFFICE

IN RESPONSE TO A RESOLUTION PASSED BY THE SENATE

ON FEBRUARY 2, 1864

RELATIVE TO THE LANDS BELONGING TO THE UNITED STATES

IN THE TERRITORY OF ARIZONA

AND IN THE TERRITORY OF NEW MEXICO

AND IN THE TERRITORY OF CALIFORNIA

AND IN THE TERRITORY OF ILLINOIS

AND IN THE TERRITORY OF INDIANA

AND IN THE TERRITORY OF KENTUCKY

AND IN THE TERRITORY OF LOUISIANA

AND IN THE TERRITORY OF MISSISSIPPI

AND IN THE TERRITORY OF ALABAMA

AND IN THE TERRITORY OF GEORGIA

AND IN THE TERRITORY OF FLORIDA

AND IN THE TERRITORY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

AND IN THE TERRITORY OF MISSOURI

TO HIS GRACE
THE DUKE OF
LAUDERDALE, &c.
HIS MAJESTIES HIGH
COMMISSIONER FOR
SCOTLAND.



AT IT PLEASE
YOUR GRACE.

*The noble Character which you do now so
worthily bear, together with the more last-*

The Epistle Dedicatory.

ing and inward Chara^dlers of Your Princely mind, did set me beyond doubting to whom this Address was to be made: For to whom is a vindication of the Authority and Laws of this Kingdom so due, as to Your Grace, to whom His Majesty hath by a Royal Delegation, committed the administration of Affairs among us; and under whose wise and happy conduct, we have enjoyed so long a tract of uninterrupted tranquillity? But it is not only Your illustrious quality that entitles You to this Dedication. No, Great Prince, greater in Your mind, than by Your fortune; there is somewhat more inward to You, than the gifts of fortune; which, as it proves her not blind in this instance, so commands all the respect can be payed Your Grace, by such who are honoured with so much knowledg of You, as hath fallen to the happy share of Your poorest servant.

But, My Lord, since all I can say either of the vast endowments of Your Mind, or of the particular engagements I lie under to honour You, must needs fall short of my sense

The Epistle Dedicatory.

sense of both; and what is just to be said, is not fit for me to express; the least appearances of flattery being as unpleasant to You, as unbecoming one of my Station: I must quit this Theme, which is too great for me to manage; and only add, that I know Your understanding, in such debates as are here managed, to be so profound, and your judgment so well balanced, that as You deservedly pass for a Master in all learning; so, if these Sheets be so happy as to be well accounted of by You, I shall the less value or apprehend the snarlings of all Censurers. I pretend not by prefixing so great a Name to these Conferences, to be secure from Censure by Your Patrociny, since these Enemies of all Order and Authority (with whom I deal) will rather be provoked from that, to lash me with the more severity.

I shall not to this add my poor thoughts of what this time and the tempers of those with whom we deal, seems to call for, since by so doing, I should become more ridiculous than Phormio was, when he enter-

The Epistle Dedicatory.

tained the redoubted Hannibal, with a pedantick discourse of a Generals conduct. It is from Your Graces deep judgment and great experience, that we all expect and long for a happy settlement, wherein that success and blessings may attend Your endeavours, shall be prayed for more earnestly by none alive, than by,

May it please YOUR GRACE,

Your Graces most humble,

most faithful, and most

obliged servant,

G. BURNET.

PRINCETON

THEOLOGICAL
TO THE

READER.



OW sad, but how full a Commentary doth the age we live in, give on these words of our Lord, *Luke 12. 49. I am come to send fire on the earth: suppose you that I am come to give peace on*

the earth; I tell you, nay; but rather division: for from henceforth there shall be five in one house divided. Do we not see the Father divided against the Son, and the Son against the Father, and engaging into such angry heats and mortal feuds, upon colors of Religion, as if the seed of the Word of GOD, like *Cadmus* teeth, had spawned a generation of cruel and bloud-thirsty men: But how surprizing is the Wonder, when Religion becomes the pretence, and seems to give the rise to these animosities, since the wisdom and goodness of GOD hath devised nothing more proper and powerful for over-ruling all the secret passions of the mind, and for

To the Reader.

mortifying of all boisterous disorders? The Doctrine delivered by our meek and lowly Master, teacheth us the great Lessons of humility, of self-diffidence, and self-contempt, guards against the undervaluing of others, and the over-rating of our selves, gives check to wrath, anger, emulation and envy, hatred and malice, railing and censuring: And in a word, designs the moulding our natures into a conformity with its blessed Author: who when he was reviled, reviled not again; but practised without a blemish, those great Lessons he taught his Disciples, of doing good for evil, loving his Enemies, and praying for such as despitefully used him. But how far have we fallen from that lovely Pattern? And how is the serene and peaceable visage of Christianity transformed into a sour cankered and surly temper, as if that which obliged us to love all men, should engage us to look morose on all but a handful of a party: and that which should dilate our love to all mankind, is given for a ground of contracting it to a few as ill natured as our selves.

Is there not a generation among us who highly value themselves, and all of their own form? but whoso differs from them, is sure of their fiercest spite, and bitterest Censures. Are the lives of such as differ from them vertuous, then they say they are good moral men: But, alas! they
know

To the Reader.

know not what it is to be spiritual. Again, are they devout and grave, then they are called Monastick people, Juglers, or Papists. And if nothing can be fastened on them, the charge of hypocrisie is the last shift of malice: Or if they have been guilty of any failings and mistakes, they are so far from covering or disguising of them; that on the contrary, the relating, the aggravating, and the commenting on these, is the main subject of all their discourses. And if they go on a Visit, the first Civilities are scarce over, when these Stories (true or false, all is to one purpose) come to make up their conversation. Who can have the least tincture of the Christian Spirit, and look on without sad regrades, and see this bitter, fierce, and cruel venom poisoning the several *Sects* and divisions of Christendom? The root and spring whereof is no other than a carnal, proud, and unmortified temper: for few are so Atheistical, but they desire to pass, both in their own account, and in the opinion of others, for good Christians: but when they find how hard a thing it is to be a Christian indeed, and that they must mortifie all their carnal appetites, their fierce passions, and swellings of pride, despise the world, and be resigned in all things to the Will of GOD, before they can deserve that noble Character, then they pursue another method more grateful to their
corrupt

corrupt minds, which is to list themselves under a party, to cherish and value the Heads and Leaders of it, and to divide their kindness to all of their stamp: they stiffly adhere to the forms, and maintain all the humors and opinions of that Party to which they have associated themselves, and they whet their Spirits and sharpen their Tongues against all of another mould, which some do with an undisguised fierceness: Other with a visage of more gravity, by which they give the deeper wounds. What sad effects flow from this Spirit is too visible; and I love not to play the Diviner, or to presage all the mischief it threatens: but certain it is that the great business of Religion lies under an universal neglect, while every one looks more abroad on his Neighbor, than inwardly on himself; and all study more the advancement of a Party, than the true interest of Religion.

I deny not but zeal for *G O D* must appear, when we see indignities done to his holy Name; in a just indignation at these who so dishonour him; but what relation have little small differences about matters which have no tendency for advancing the Image of *G O D* in our Souls, to that; since both sides of the debate may be well maintained without the least indignity done to *G O D*, or his holy Gospel? What

op-

To the Reader.

opposition to the Will of GOD, or what harm to Souls can flow from so innocent a practice, as the fixing some Churchmen over others, for observing, directing, reproving, and coercing of the rest, that this should occasion such endless brawlings, and such hot contentions? But supposing the grounds of our divisions, as great as any angry Disputer can imagine them, then certainly our zeal for them should be tempered, according to the Rules and Spirit of the Gospel. Is it a Christian temper that our spirits should boil with rage against all of another persuasion, so that we cannot think of them without secret commotions of anger and disdain, which breaks often out into sour looks, ridiculous jearings, bitter scoffings and invectives, and in attempts at blood and cruelty? How long shall our *Nadabs* and *Abihus* burn this wild-fire on the Altar of GOD, whose flames should be peaceful, and such as descend from Heaven? When we see any endangering their Souls by erroneous Opinions, or bad practices, had we the divine Spirit in us, it would set us to our secret mournings for them: our hearts would melt in compassion towards them, and not burn in rage against them: and we would attempt for their recovery, and not contrive their ruin. The one bears on it a clear impress of that nature which is Love, in
which

To the Reader.

which none can have interest, or union, but such as dwell and abide in Love : but the other bears on it the lively signature of him that was a murderer from the beginning : and all that is mischievous or cruel, is of that evil one, and tends to the subversion of mankind ; as well as the ruin of true Religion.

Another great Rule by which the Peace and Order of all human Societies is maintained and advanced, is obedience to the Laws, and submission to the Authority of these whom *G O D* hath set over us, to govern and defend us ; to whose Commands if absolute Obedience be not payed, ever till they contradict the Laws of *G O D*, there can be neither peace nor order among men, as long as every one prefers his own humour or inclination to the Laws of the Society in which he lives. Now it cannot be denied to be one of the sins of the age we live in, that small regard is had to that authority *G O D* hath committed to his Vicegerents on earth : The evidence whereof is palpable, since the bending or slackening of the execution of Laws is made the measure of most mens Obedience, and not the conscience of that duty we owe the commands of our Rulers : for what is more servile and unbecoming a man, not to say a Christian, than to yield Obedience when overawed by force ; and to leap from it when allured by

by

To the Reader.

by gentler methods? If Generosity were our principle, we should be sooner vanquished by the one, than cudgelled by the other: Or if Conscience acted us, the Obligation of the Law would equally bind, whether backed with a strict Execution, or slackened into more impunity. Hence it appears how few there are who judg themselves bound to pay that reverence to the Persons, and that Obedience to the Commands of these G O D hath vested with his Authority, which the Laws of Nature and Religion do exact. And the root of all this disobedience and contempt, can be no other, but unruly and ungoverned pride; which disdains to submit to others, and exalts it self above these who are called Gods. The humble are tractable and obedient; but the self-willed are stubborn and rebellious. Yet the height of many mens pride rests not in a bare disobedience, but designs the subverting of Thrones, and the shaking of Kingdoms, unless governed by their own measures.

Among all the Heresies this age hath spawned, there is not one more contrary to the whole design of Religion, and more destructive of mankind, than is that bloody Opinion of defending Religion by Arms, and of forcible resistance upon the colour of preserving Religion. The wisdom of that Policy is earthly, sensual
and

To the Reader.

and devillish, favoring of a carnal unmortified and impatient mind, that cannot bear the Cross, nor trust to the Providence of *G O D*: and yet with how much zeal is this doctrine maintained and propagated, as if on it hung both the Law and the Prophets? Neither is the zeal used for its defence only meant for the vindicating of what is past, but on purpose advanced for reacting the same Tragedies: which some late villainous attempts have too clearly discovered, some of these black Arts (tho written in white) being by a happy providence of *G O D* (by the intercepting of *R. Mac* his Letters which contained not a few of their rebellious practisings and designs) brought to light.

Indeed the consideration of these evils should call on all to reflect on the sad posture wherein we are, and the evident signatures of the Divine displeasure under which we lie: from which it appears that *G O D* hath no pleasure in us, nor will be glorified among us: that so we may discern the *signs of the times*, and by all these sad indications may begin to apprehend our danger, and so turn to *G O D* with our whole hearts; every one repenting of the works of his hands, and contributing his prayers and endeavours for a more general Reformation. It is not by Political Arts, nor by the execution of penal Laws, that the power of Religion can be recovered

To the Reader.

vered from these decays, under which it hath so long suffered. No, no, we must consider wherein we have provoked *GOD* to chastise us in this fashion, by letting loose among us a Spirit of uncharitableness, giddiness, cruelty and sedition: And the progress of these and other great evils, we ought to charge on our own faultiness, who have provoked *GOD* to plead a Controversie with us in so severe a manner. This is the method we ought to follow, which if we did, we might sooner look for the Divine protection and assistance: and then we should experience it to be better to put our confidence in *GOD*, than to put our confidence in men.

Indeed such a Reformation of our lives and hearts, would more strongly plead our cause, and advance our interest, than the most learned Disputes, or the severest Laws, tho followed with a most vigorous execution: Let us not therefore repine at the contempt we lie under, or the hazard we are exposed to; nor complain of the non-execution of Laws; but let us examine wherein we have walked contrary to the Laws of *CHRIST* in his Gospel, by which we have provoked *GOD* to render us base and contemptible before the people. In a word, till we condemn our selves more, and others less, and think more of reforming our selves, and less of punishing others, we look not like proper
Objects

To the Reader.

Objects of Mercy, or fit for a deliverance.

But I shall quit this purpose to give some account of the following Conferences. Some years ago, a small *Book of Dialogues betwixt the Conformist and Nonconformist* was published, and received with the general applause and good liking of all, who were so far unprepossessed as to consider the plain and simple reasonings were there laid open; but presently all the mouths of the enraged Zealots were set a yelping and snarling at it, and at its suspected Author: some laughed at it, others despised it, and all of them were angry: some threatned a speedy answer, others doubting of the performance, said, it deserved none. At length divers Pens were said to have undertaken the Task; but in end we had an answer from *beyond Sea* to it, which was received with an universal shout of victory and triumph: the Answerer acting his part with so much confidence, and edging his smatterings with so much bitterness, as if he had engaged with a compound of Ignorance and Atheism. At first reading I could not but pity one who triumphed so confidently with so little reason, and regrave the bitterness of his spirit, who belched up gall and wormwood upon every occasion. Yet in some matters of fact and History, I deny not but his confidence made me imagine truth might be on his side; but when I examined things

To the Reader.

things from their Fountains, I know not what verdict to pass on him, who fell in so many mistakes, and stumbled at every step. Most of his errors I imputed to his second-hand reading, for he seems to have risen no higher in his learning than the reading of *Pamphlets*: and it is like, hath that quarrel with *Antiquity*, that there is not a forty year old Author in his Closet; and so much is he beholden to the labours of others, that if one unplume him of what is borrowed, nothing will remain but scoldings, and nonsense. For when he meets with any thing out of the *Road*, it is not unpleasant to see how brow-illied he is; and so unequal in his stile, that sometimes he flies high on borrowed wings, and immediately he halts and crawls when on his own legs. I was not soon resolved whether such a *Scribler* deserved an Answer, since all he said that was material, had both been printed and answered full often; yet the confidence of the Author, and the value which others, much about his own size of knowledg and modesty, did set on his labors, made me think it necessary to say a little more on these things, which were perhaps too overly glanced at by the *Conformist* in the *Dialogues*: and my interest in that Person secured me from apprehending his mistakes of my interposing in this quarrel; for indeed what he said was so far from being shaken by this pretended

To the Reader:

tended trifling Answer, that as a Person of great judgment and worth, said, *No more pains was needful for refuting the Answer, but the reading over the Dialogues, whose strength remained entire after all his attempts against them.*

I was doubtful what method to pursue in the following sheets, since I ever loathed the answering of Books by retail, as an endless and worthless labor: for when should I have done, did I call him to account for all his incoherencies and impertinencies, and examine all his simpering distinctions, and whiffling answers? I resolved therefore at one dash to wave all that, and to examine the matters of greater and more public concern, with that clearness of expression which befits such Subjects, and with so much brevity, as might not frighten away the more superficial Readers, nor surfeit the more laborious. Therefore I have not stayed to make good all the *Conformists* Opinions or arguments, hinted in these short *Dialogues*, but have left the examining of them, and the Answers made to them, to the consideration of the unprejudged Reader, and so have considered nothing of what he answers to the fifth and sixth *Dialogues*. To the fifth *Dialogue*, wherein set forms for Worship are pleaded for, he answers by confessing their lawfulness, arguing only against the imposing them; but this I meet with in my
second

To the Reader.

second Conference, wherein I assert the binding Authority of Laws in all things lawful. And for his Answers to the sixth *Dialogue*, they concern me not, being made up of reflections: It is true, to shew his Common place reading, he gives a long discourse of Justification, but to very little purpose, since upon the matter the *Conformist* differs nothing from him: And for the justifying or condemning some phrases or modes of speech, they are not worth the while to debate about them: All my quarrel at these long winded Common places, being, that by a pretence of making matters clearer, they darken them with a multiplicity of words, and an intricacy of phrases. And as this is justly censurable on every head about which it is employed, so it is more particularly in the matter of Justification, which being the ground of our hope and joy, should be so cleared, that no difficulty nor nicety get into our conceptions about it. What then can be clearer than that GOD in consideration of his Sons sufferings, offers free pardon to all sinners, on the terms of their forsaking their sins, their accepting his mercy through his Son, and their obedience to the rules of his Gospel, which whosoever do, are actually in the favor of GOD, made partakers of his Grace, and shall in due time be admitted to his Glory? This being the *Conformist's*

To the Reader.

sense on that head, I leave it with all to consider what reason there was for making such ado about it, or for charging him with so heavy imputations. But he shrouds himself under his own innocency, and will patiently bear all the insultings and ungodly rage of that Adversary, without recriminating or answering him in his own style and dialect.

I pursue the method of a *Conference*, as being both more suitable to the purposes here canvassed, and more agreeable to the *Dialogues*, only I furnish the Scene with more persons; and I am much mistaken if the Answerer himself shall have ground to accuse me of not laying out the strength of his reasonings faithfully, since upon every occasion I put in *Isotimus* his mouth the substance of his arguings, as far as I could reach them. But to make this unpleasant peace of contention go the more easily off, I have subjoyned to it an account of the form and rules of Church-Government, as I found them to have been received in the first and purest ages of the Church: But I add no more for Preface to that work, since in the end of the last *Conference* enough is said for introduction to it.

I have divided my work in four parts and *Conferences*: The first examines the opinion of resisting lawful Magistrates upon the pretence of defending Religion. The second con-
siders

To the Reader.

siders the Authority of Laws, and the obedience due to them, together with the Kings Supremacy in matters Ecclesiastical. The third examines the spirit that acted during the late times and Wars, and continues yet to divide us by Schism and faction. And the fourth examines the lawfulness and usefulness of Episcopacy.

I must now release my Reader from the delay this *Introduction* may have occasioned him, without the usual formality of *Apologies*, for the defects the following papers are guilty of, since I know these generally prevail but little for gaining what they desire: but shall only say, that this morose way of writing, by engaging into *Controversies*, is as contrary to my *Genius* as to any mans alive: For I know well how little such writings prevail for convincing of any, and that by them the most part are rather hardened into more wilfulness, and exasperated into more bitterness: Yet for this once I was prevailed on to do violence to my own inclinations, by this *Patrociny* of the authority and laws of that Church and Kingdom wherein I live.

I am so far from thinking my self concerned to make Apology for the slowness of this Piece its appearance in publick, that I encline rather to make excuses for its coming abroad too soon. That it was ready near a twelve-month ago, can be witnessed by many who then saw it. Yet I

To the Reader.

was willing to let it lye some time by me, and my aversion from the motions of the Press, put it often under debate with me whether I should stifle it, or give it vent: at length I yielded to the frequent importunities of my friends who assaulted me from all hands, and told me how much it was longed for, and what insultings were made upon the delay of its publication.

And by what is near the end of the third *Conference*, it will appear that it was written before the discovery of these who had robbed and wounded the Ministers in the West of *Scotland*. I let what is there said continue as it was written, before the discovery, but shall add somewhat here. In *September* last, after a new robbery had been committed on another conformable Minister, whose actors no search could discover; some few days had not passed over, when by a strange Providence one of them was catched on another account by a brave Soldier, and being seized, such indications of his accession to the robbery were found about him, that he to prevent torture, confessed not only his own guilt, but discovered a great many more: most of them escaped, yet three were taken, and had Justice done on them, with him who had been their chief Leader: and who continued to cant it out highly after he got his Sentence, talking of his blood as innocently shed, and
railing

To the Reader.

railing against the Prelats and Curats; though before Sentence he was basely sordid, as any could be. One of his complices who died with more sense, acknowledged, when he spake his last words, that bitter zeal had prompted him to that villany, and not covetousness, or a design of robbing their goods. Yet I shall not conceal what I was a witness to, when a Minister of the Presbyterian perswasion being with them (for two of them would willingly admit of none that were Episcopal) after he had taken pains to convince the chief Robber of the atrociousness of his crimes, which was no easie task, he charged him to discover if either Gentlemen, or Ministers, had prompted or cherish'd him in it, or been conscious to his committing these robberies, he cleared all, except a few particular and mean persons who went sharers with him. And by this fair and ingenuous procedure, the Reader may judge how far the Author is from a design of lodging infamy on these who differ from him, when of his own accord he offers a testimony for their vindication. But I shall leave this purpose, and the further prefacing at once.

If my poor labors be blessed with any measure of success, I humbly offer up the praise of it to him from whom I derive all I have, and to whom I owe the praise of all I can do. But if
these

To the Reader.

these attempts bring forth none of the wished-for effects, I shall have this satisfaction, that I have sincerely and seriously studied the calming the passions, and the clearing the mistakes of these among whom I live: so that more lyes not on me, but to follow my endeavours with my most earnest prayers, that the *G O D* of Peace may in this our day, cause us discern and consider these things which belong to our Peace.

THE

THE HEADS TREATED OF in these Conferences.

THe first Conference examines the origine and power of Magistracy, and whether Subjects may by arms resist their Sovereigns on the account, or pretence of defending Religion against Tyranny, and unjust oppression? And whether the King of Scotland be a Sovereign Prince, or limited, so that he may be called to account, and coerced by force?

The second examines the nature of humane Laws, and of the obedience due to them, and the Civil Magistrates Right of enacting Laws in matters Ecclesiastical.

The third examines the grounds and progress of the late Wars, whether they were Defensive or Invasive, and what Spirit did then prevail? And the grounds of our present Schism are considered.

The fourth examines the origine, lawfulness, and usefulness of Episcopal Government, which is concluded; with an account of the Primitive Constitution and Government of the Churches that were first gathered and planted.

THE

The COLLOCUTORS.

<i>Eudaimon.</i>	<i>A Moderate man.</i>
<i>Philarchæus.</i>	<i>An Episcopal man.</i>
<i>Isotimus.</i>	<i>A Presbyterian.</i>
<i>Basilus.</i>	<i>An Asserter of the Kings Authority.</i>
<i>Criticus.</i>	<i>One well studied in Scripture.</i>
<i>Polybister.</i>	<i>An Historian.</i>

THE FIRST CONFERENCE.

Eudaimon.

YOU are welcome, my good Friends, and the rather that you come in such a number, whereby our converse shall be the more agreeable. Pray, sit down.

Philarcheus. The rules of Custom should make us begin with asking after your Health, and what News you have.

Eud. Truly the first is not worth enquiring after; and for the other, you know how seldom I stir abroad, and how few break in upon my retirement, so that you can expect nothing from me; but you have brought one with you who uses to know every thing that is done.

Isotimus. I know you mean me: the truth is, I am very glad to hear every thing that passeth; and think it no piece of Virtue to be so

B

uncon-

unconcerned in what befalls the Church of GOD, as never to look after it : but you are much wronged, if notwithstanding all your seeming abstraction, you be not deeper in the knowledge of Affairs than any of us: however since you expect News from me, I was just now reading some Books lately printed at *Holland*, and particularly an accurate and learned Confutation of these virulent *Dialogues* you were wont to magnifie so much: and it doth my heart good to see how he baffles the writer of them on every occasion; for he hath answered every word of them so well, and so home, that I believe we shall not see a reply in haste.

Philarcheus. I suppose we have all seen the Book, but it is like you are singular in your opinion of it : I shall not deny its Author his deserved praises : he hath been faithful in setting down most of the Arguments used in the *Dialogues*, and no less careful to gather together all the vulgar answers to them, and truly hath said as much as can be said for his Cause. Neither writes he without art; for when he is pinched, he drives off the Reader with a great many preliminary things, to make him forget the purpose, and to gain a more easie assent to what he asserts. I confess his Stile is rugged and harsh, so that it was not without pain I wrestled through it: but of all I have seen, he hath fallen on the surest

surest way to gain an Applause from the Vulgar ; for he acts the greatest Confidence imaginable, and rails at his Adversary with so much contempt, and malice, that he is sure to be thought well of, by these who judge of a man more by his voice, and the impresses of earnestness, and passion he discovers, than by the weight of what he saith.

End. These things may well take with the ignorant Rabble, with whom it is like he designs to triumph : but truly such as understand either the civilities of good Nature, or the meekness of a Christian, will be little edified with them. Indeed I am amazed to see so much indiscretion and bitterness fall from any mans Pen who hath read *S. Paul*, condemning railings, evil surmisings, and perverse disputings.

Isot. Who begun the scolding ? The truth is, there are some who think they may rail with a priviledge, and if any in soberness tell them of their faults, they accuse them of bitterness : but was there ever any thing seen more waspish than these *Dialogues* ? whose design seems to have been the disgracing of a whole Party, and all their actions for many years : If then the Atheism, the blasphemy, the mockery, the enmity to GOD and Religion, the ignorance, the malice, the folly and arrogance of such a confident Babler be discovered, you are so ten-

der hooffed *forsooth*, as to complain of railings.

End. It seems these writings have made a deep Impression on you, you have got so exactly into their stile: but this is a place where Passion is seldom cherished, therefore we will expect no more of that strain from you. But to deal freely with you, there were some Expressions in these *Dialogues* with which I was not well satisfied; but the whole of them had such a visage of Serenity, that I wonder how they are so accused. It is true the *Conformist* deals very plainly, and yet ere we part, I can perhaps satisfy you: he said but a little of what he might have said: But withal, remember how severely, he that was meekness it self, treated the *Scribes* and the *Pharisees*, and he having charged his Followers to beware of their leaven, it is obedience to his Command to search out that leaven, that it may leaven us no more. And when any of a Party are so exalted in their own conceit, as to despise and disparage all others, the love, Ministers of the Gospel owe the Souls of their Flocks, obligeth them to unmask them. As to these poor simple Reproaches that are cast on the Person of that Author, as they are known to be false and unjust, so they are done in a strain that seems equally void of Wit and Goodness. But we shall meddle no more in these personal differences, after I have told you what
I heard

I heard the Author of that Conference lay upon this subject: he said, *He was so far from being displeased with the Author of this Answer, that he was only sorry he knew not who he was, that he might seek an opportunity of obliging him. For the things charged on him, if he was guilty of them, he needed very many prayers; but if innocent, the other needed no fewer who so unjustly accused him: but a day comes wherein a righteous Judge will judge betwixt them: and this was the utmost displeasure he expressed; adding, That he had another sense of the account he must give for his hours, than to engage in a Counterscuffle, or to play at such small game, as a particular examen of that Book would amount to: And he judged it unworthy of him to turn Executioner on that man's Reputation, by enquiring into all the escapes of his Book which are too obvious. But he is willing to stand or fall by the decision of rational and impartial Minds, only where he was either too short, or where the Answerer hath raised so much Mist as might obscure a less discerning Reader: he will (when he gets out of the throng wherein his Employment doth at present engage him) offer a clearer account of the matters in question, without tracing of that poor Creature, who, it is like, expects to be recorded among the Learned Writers of the Age, and the Champions of Truth.*

Bes. We have nothing to do with what is

personal among these Writers: But since so many of us have met so happily, and seem a little acquainted with these Questions, let us according to our wonted freedom, toss these debates among us, without heat or reflections: which signifie nothing but to express the strength of his Passions, and the weakness of his Reasons who makes use of them. And indeed the matter of the greatest Importance is, *the point of Subjects resisting their Sovereigns, in the defence of Religion*, which deserves to be the better cleared, since it is not a nicety of the School, or a speculation of Philosophers, but a matter of Practice, and that which (if received) seems to threaten endless Wars and Confusions.

Crit. I am no great Disputer, but shall be gladly a witness to your debate, and upon occasions shall presume to offer what I have gleaned among the Critical Writers on Scripture: and I hope *Isotimus's* Memory is so good, that he will carefully suggest the Arguments used by the Patrons of defensive Arms.

Isot. I will not undertake too much, but shall take care not to betray this good Cause, yet I will not have the Verdict passed upon my defence of it; however I shall not sneak so shamefully as the *Nonconformist* did in the *Dialogues*.

End. I hope I shall not need to caution you
any

any more against reflections: but as for the alledged treachery of your friend the *Nonconformist*, it may be referred to all *Scotland*, if what he saith be not what is put in the mouths of all the People about these matters, and truly this Answer adds so little to him, that nothing can free him so well of that treachery, as the reading of this new Book. But to our purpose: The Question is first in general, *If Subjects under a lawful Sovereign when oppressed in their established Religion, may by Arms defend themselves, and resist the Magistrates?* Let this be first discussed in general, and next it shall be considered how far this will quadrat with our present Case, or our late Troubles.

Isot. I like your method well, and that we may follow it, consider (see pag. 20. of the Answer, and *Jus populi all over*) if their can be any thing more evident from the *Laws of Nature*, than that men ought to defend themselves, when unjustly assaulted? And since the Law of Nature teacheth men not to murder themselves, it by the same force binds them to hinder another to do it, since he that doth not hinder another from committing a Crime, when it is in his power so to do, becomes guilty of the crime committed; he is then a self-murderer who doth not defend himself from unjust force. Besides, what is the end of all Societies, but mutual Protection?

Did not the People at first choose Princes for their Protection? Or do you imagine it was to satisfy the Pride and Cruelty of individual persons? It was then the end of Societies, that Justice and Peace might be maintain'd: so when this is inverted, the Subjects are again to resume their own conditional surrender, and to coerce the Magistrate, who, forgetful of the ends of his Authority, doth so corrupt it. And since the great design of man should be *to serve GOD, and to worship him in spirit and in truth*, this is to be preferred to all things else, as being of the greatest Importance. If then Magistrates, whom *S. Peter* (1 Pet. 2. 13.) calls *the Ordinances of men*, or humane Creatures, do force their Subjects from the true Worship of GOD, they ought to be restrained, and the Cause of GOD must be maintained, notwithstanding their unjust Laws or cruel Tyranny.

Bas. You have indeed put such colours on your Opinion, that I should be much shaken from mine, were not my persuasion well grounded. But to examine what you have said, you must distinguish well betwixt the *Laws of Nature*, and *the Rights or permissions of Nature*: the first are unalterable Obligations, by which all men are bound, which can be reversed by no positive Law, and transgressed by no Person, upon no occasion: for the Law of Nature is the

Image

Image of G O D yet remaining in some degrees on the Souls of men, and is nothing else save certain notions of Truth, impressed by G O D on the Souls of all men that enjoy the exercise of Reason. Now self-defence cannot be a Law of Nature, otherwise it could never be dispensed with without a Sin; nay, were a man never so criminal: For as in no case a man may kill himself, were he never so guilty; so by that reasoning of yours, he ought not to suffer himself to be killed, neither should any Malefactor submit to the Sentence of the Judge, but stand to his defence by all the force he could raise. And it will not serve turn, to say, that for the good of the Society he ought to submit; for no man must violate the Laws of Nature, were it on never so good a design: and since the utmost standard of our love to our Neighbors, is to love them as our selves, no consideration of the good of others can oblige one to yield up his Life, if bound by the Law of Nature to defend it.

Crit. If I may interrupt you, I should tell you that as among all Nations it hath been counted Heroical to die for ones Country, or for the good of others, so the Apostle speaks, (*Rom. 5. 7.*) of those *who for good men would dare to die.* But chiefly CHRIST'S dying for us, shews that self-defence can be no Law of Nature:
other-

otherwise CHRIST who filled all Righteousness, had never contradicted the Laws of Nature.

Bas. I thank you for your remark, which was pertinent. But next, consider there are some *rights or permissions of Nature*, which are allowed us, but not required of us, as *propriety of goods, marriage*, and other such like things, which whoso doth not pretend to, he cannot be said to violate the Laws of Nature, only for some greater consideration he forgoes these Priviledges it allows. And take men out of a Society, I acknowledge forcible Resistance of any violent Assailant, to be one of the rights of Nature, which every man may make use of without a Fault, or dispense with likewise at his pleasure: But Societies being Associations of People under a Head, who hath the power of Life and Death, that sets it beyond doubt, that the Head must only judge, when the Subjects do justly fore-seal their Lives or not: which before I go about to evince, I must remove that vulgar Error, of a Magistrate's deriving his power from the surrender of the People. None can surrender what they have not: take then a multitude of People not yet associated, none of them hath power of his own Life, neither hath he power of his Neighbors, since no man out of a Society may kill another, were his Crime never so great,

great, much less be his own murderer; and a multitude of People not yet associated, are but so many individual Persons; therefore the power of the Sword is not from the People, nor any of their Delegation, but is from GOD.

Isot. You will pardon me to tell you, that the People must give the power, since GOD did it never by a Voice from Heaven, or by a Prophets command, except in some Instances among the *Israelites*, where even that was not done, but upon the previous desire of the People. And for what you say of the Peoples having no right to kill themselves, they only consent to submit to the Magistrates Sentence, when guilty.

Basil. This will then infallibly prove, that forcible self-defence cannot be a Law of Nature, but only a Right; otherwise we could not thus dispense with it. But if though guilty, I ought not to kill my self, neither can I so much as consent that another do it: Hence it is, that the original of *Magistracy* must be from GOD, who only can invest the *Prince* with the power of the Sword.

Polyb. I could say much in Confirmation of that, from the universal Sense of all Nations, who ever looked on the Magistrates power, as Sacred and Divine: but these things are so copiously adduced by others, that I may well spare my labor.

Crit.

Crit. Nay, a greater authority is *St. Paul's*, *Rom. 13. 1.* who saith, *That the powers that were then, were ordained of GOD:* which on the way saith strongly, for asserting the right of a Conquerour, after some prescription, since if either we consider the power of the *Roman Empire* over the world, or of their Emperours over them, both will be found to have no better title than Conquest, and yet they were ordained of *GOD*, and not to be resisted, but submitted to, under the hazard of *resisting the Ordinance of GOD*, and *receiving of damnation*, (*p. 2.*) And it is like, the sacredness of the *Magistrates power*, was a part of the traditional Religion conveyed from *Noah* to his posterity, as was the practice of extraordinary Sacrifices.

Basil. It is not to be denied but a people may chuse their own form of Government, and the persons in whose hands it shall be deposited: and the Sovereignty is in their hands, of whom they do thus freely make choice: so that if they expressly agree, that any Administrators of the power, by what name soever designed, Kings, Lords, or whatever else, shall be accountable to them; in that case, the Sovereignty lies in the major part of the people, and these Administrators are subject to them, as to the Supreme. But when it is agreed in whose hands the Sovereign power lies, and that it is
not

not with the people; then if the people pretend to the sword, they invade GODS right, and that which he hath devolved on his Vicegerent. And as in marriage either of the parties make a free choice, but the Marriage-bond is of GOD, neither is it free for them afterwards to refile upon pretence of injuries, till that which GOD hath declared to be a breach of the bond, be committed by either party: so though the election of the Sovereign may be of the people, yet the tie of subjection is of GOD, and therefore is not to be shaken off, without we have expresse warrant from him. And according to your reasoning, one that hath made a bad choice in his marriage, may argue that marriage was intended for a help and comfort to man, and for propagation; therefore when these things are missed in a marriage, that voluntary contract may be refiled from; and all this will conclude as well to unty an ill chosen marriage, as to shake off a Sovereign.

Philarch. To this reasoning I shall add what seems from rational conjectures, and such hints as we can expect of things at so great a distance from us, to have been the rise of Magistracy. We find no warrant to kill, no not for murder before the Floud, as appears from the instances of *Cain* and *Lamech*, so no Magistracy appears to have been then: Yet from what GOD said
to

to *Cain*, *Gen. 4. 7.* we see, *the elder brother was to rule over the younger.* But the want of Magistracy before the *Flood*, was perhaps none of the least occasions of the wickedness *which was great upon earth*; but to *Noah* was the Law first given of punishing murder by death, *Gen. 9. 6.* and he was undoubtedly cloathed with that power. So his eldest Son coming in his place by the right of representation, and being by the right of primogeniture asserted before the *Flood* to be over his Brethren, was cloathed with the same power, and so it should have descended by the order of Nature still to the first-born. But afterwards Families divided, and went over the world to people it, whereby the single jurisdiction of one Emperor, could not serve the end of Government, especially in that rude time, in which none of these ways of correspondence, which after Ages have invented, were fallen upon. These Families did then, or at least by that Law of G O D of the elder Brothers power, ought to have been subject to the eldest of their several Families.

And another rise of *Magistracy*, was the poverty of many who sold themselves to others that were Richer, and were in all Nations subject to them, both they and their children: and this was very early begun, for *Abraham's* family consisted of 318. persons, and the many little
Kings

Kings at that time seem to have risen out of these Families : for the posterity of these servants were likewise under the Masters Authority : and these servants were by their Masters pleasure to live or lie; nor had they any right to resist this unjust force : But afterwards emancipation was used, some dominion being still reserved : and it is highly probable, that from these numerous Families, did most of the little Kingdoms then in the world spring up ; afterwards the more aspiring came to pretend over others, and so great Empires rose by their Conquests.

Crit. I know it is strongly pretended, that the state of servitude, or such a surrender of ones life, or liberty, as subjects it to the tyranny of another, is not lawful: but this will be found groundless : for though *even the Law of GOD counted the servants a Man's money, so that he was not to be punished, though he had smitten them with a rod, so that they died, provided they lived a day or two after it, Exod. 21. 20, 21.* Yet in that dispensation it was not unlawful to be a servant; nay, nor unlawful to continue in that state for ever, and not accept of the emancipation which was provided to them in *the year of Jubily*. Neither is this state declared unlawful under the Gospel, since *S. Paul saith, 1 Cor. 7. 21. Art thou called being a servant, care not for it : but if thou mayst be free,*

free, use it rather : By which we see the Gospel doth not emancipate servants, but placeth that state among things which may be lawfully submitted to, though liberty be preferable.

Basil. From this it may be well inferred, that if a Society have so intirely surrendred themselves that they are in no better case than were the servants among the *Romans* or *Hebrews*, the thing is not unlawful; nor can they make it void, or resume the freedom without his consent whose servants they are: and as *S. Peter* tells, *1 Pet. 2. 18. The servants to submit to their Masters, tho punishing them wrongfully.* By whom all know that he means not of hired, but of bought servants: so if a people be under any degrees of that state, they ought to submit, not only to the good, but to the froward: and still it appears that the Sword is only in the Magistrates hand, and that the people have no claim to it. It is true, in case the Magistrate be furious, or desert his right, or expose his Kingdoms to the fury of others, the Laws and Sense of all Nations agree, that the States of the Land are to be the Administrators of the power, till he recover himself: But the instance of *Nebuchadnezzar*, *Dan. 4. 26.* shews, that still the Kingdom should be sure to him when he recovers.

Ifot. Now you begin to yield to truth, and
con-

confess, that a Magistrate, when he grossly abuseth his Power, may be coërced : this then shews that the People are not slaves.

Basil. The Case varies very much when the abuse is such that it tends to a total Subversion, which may be called justly a *Phrensie*, since no man is capable of it till he be under some lesion of his mind ; in which case, the Power is to be administred by others, for the Prince and his Peoples safety : But this will never prove that a Magistrate governing by Law, though there be great errors in his Government, ought to be coërced : otherwise you must open a door to perpetual Broils, since every one by these Maxims becomes Judge ; and where he is both Judge and Party, he is not like to be cast in his Pretensions : And even few Malefactors die, but they think hard measure is given them. If then forcible self-defence be to be followed, none of these should yield up their Lives without using all attempts for rescuing them.

End. Whatever other Cases allow of, certainly the defence of Religion by Arms is never to be admitted : for the nature of Christian Religion is such, that it excludes all carnal Weapons from its defence. And when I consider how expressly *CHRIST* forbids his disciples to resist evil, *Matth. 25. 39.* how severely that resistance is condemned by *S. Paul*, and that condemnation is

declared the Punishment of it, I am forced to cry out, Oh! what times have we fallen in, in which men dare against the expresse Laws of the Gospel, defend that practice upon which GOD hath passed this condemnation, *If who-soever break the least of these Commandments, and teach men so to do, shall be called the least in the Kingdom of GOD*: What shall their portion be who teach men to break one of the greatest of these Commandments, such as are the Laws of Peace and Subjection? And what may we not look for from such Teachers, who dare tax that glorious Doctrine of patient Suffering, as brutish and irrational, and though it be expressly said, *1 Pet. 2. 21. That CHRIST by suffering for us, left us his Example how to follow his steps*, which was followed by a glorious Cloud of Witnesses? Yet in these last days, what a brood hath sprung up, *Of men who are lovers of their own selves, traytors, heady, high-minded, lovers of pleasures, more than lovers of GOD: having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof; who creep into houses, and lead captive silly women laden with sin*? It is our sins that provoke GOD to open the bottomless pit, and let loose such locusts; but were we turning to GOD, and repenting of the works of our hands, we might hope that their power should be taken from them, and that their folly should be made known to all men.

Isot.

Isot. Who talk bigly now ? But let Reason and Scripture take place, and you shall find good warrants in the *Old Testament* for coërcing the Magistrate, and subjecting the power in the Peoples hands, (*see p. 12.*) for the People were warranted to *punish Idolaters*, *Deut. 13. 12.* And from the beginning of *Deuteronomy*, it appears that Book was directed to all *Israel*, therefore any might have punished Idolaters ; therefore the power of Reforming is with the People : And again (*see p. 13.*) the *Law of the King* is set down, *Deut. 18. 14.* which gives a clear Evidence, that the People might coërcé him : Otherwise why was that Law delivered to the People ?

Crit. I am much deceived if these Instances do conclude for your design, since the utmost they can prove, is, that some share of the executive power lay in the hands of the People among the *Jews* ; but that proves nothing : where by Law and Practice it is clear the power is wholly in the hands of Superior unaccountable Magistrates. But that the Law of the King, or of punishing Idolaters was delivered to the People, proves not that they must execute it : For the Law of Sacrifices, and all the Temple worship was also delivered to them : but I hope you will not from that infer, that the People were to judge in these matters, or to give Laws to their Priests ; neither will the Law, because addressed

to the People, prove themselves to be the executors of it; otherwise the *Epistle to the Corinthians* addressed to all the Saints in Corinth, will prove the People the Judges of Excommunication, and of the Rules of Church-worship, which are there delivered: so that though the Law was directed to all the People, yet that proves not that every precept of it concerned all the People, but that the whole of the Law was addressed to the whole People, and the respective parts of it, to all the individuals, according to their several stations: And after all this, you are to consider that some things were allowed by that Law to private Persons, which ought never to be made precedents: for the Law allowed the Friends of one that was killed by chance, to avenge the Blood on the Person that slew him, if he kept not within the City of Refuge: but that being a particular provision of their Judicial and Municipal Law, will be no warrant for such revenge in other States.

Isot. But what say you to the revolt of *Libnah*, 2 Chron. 21. 10 which revolted from *Jehoram*, because he forsook the LORD GOD of his fathers: And of *Amaziah*, 2 Chron. 25. 27. who when he turned away from following the LORD, his being killed by a Conspiracy of these in *Jerusalem*, and the fourscore valiant Priests who withstood *Uzziah*, when he went to offer

offer incense? 2 Chron. 26. 17. See p. 13, 14.

Crit. As for your instances, consider that many things are set down in the *Old Testament*, that are undoubted faults, and yet so far are they from being taxed, that they rather seem to be applauded: so it is in the case of the *Midwives lie*, not to mention the *Polygamy of the Patriarchs*; therefore it not being clear to us by what special warrants they acted, a Practice of that Dispensation will be no precedent to us. But for that of *Libnah*, it may be justly doubted if the *Libnah* there mentioned, be that City which was assigned to the *Priests*: for *Numbers* 33. 20. we meet with a *Libnah* in the journeyings of *Israel*; and both the *Syriack* and the *Arabick version*, have understood the place of that City; for they render it, the *Idumeans that dwelt at Libnah*. But whatever be in this, the particle *because*, doth not always import the design of the doer: which if you examine the *Hebrew*, will be very clear; and I shall name but one place to satisfy you, 1 Sam. 2. 25. *Elies sons hearkned not to the voice of their father, because the LORD would slay them*. But, I doubt not, you will confess this was not their motive to such disobedience: so this will import no more, but that *GOD* in his Providence permitted that revolt for a Punishment of *Jehoram's Apostasie*; neither will fair Pretences justify bad Actions:

so the utmost that place can prove, is, that they made that their pretence. But that their revolt could not be without they had also revolted from GOD, will appear from this, that the Priests were bound to give attendance by turns at the Temple, so none of them could have revolted from the King without their rejecting of GOD'S Service, as long as the King was Master of *Jerusalem*, whither no doubt they would not have come during their revolt.

As for your instance of *Amaziah*, I confess it is plain dealing, and you disclose the *Mystery of defensive Arms*, that it is but lamely maintain'd, till the Doctrine of murdering of Kings be also asserted: And indeed your Friend by this ingenuity of his, hath done that Cause a prejudice, of which many are sufficiently sensible; for this was a secret Doctrine to be instilled in corners, in the hearts of Disciples duly prepared for it, but not to be owned to the World: For if that place prove any thing, it will prove that when a King turns from following the LORD, his Subjects may conspire and slay him; how this would take among the *Fifth-Monarchy Men*, I know not; but I am sure it will be abhorred by all *Protestants*: and particularly by these who made it an Article of their Confession of Faith, That infidelity or difference of Religion, doth not make void the Magistrates just power: there-

Therefore this being a direct Breach of both fifth and sixth Commands, though it be neither marked as condemned, nor punished in that short account there given, yet it will never warrant the resisting the Ordinance of GOD, upon which GOD hath entailed Damnation. And whereas your Friend alledgeth the justice of this may be evinced from Scripture, it shews that in his Judgment, not only Tyranny, but the turning from following GOD, is a just cause for conspiring against, and killing of Kings: But I cannot see where he finds what the cause of this Conspiracy was, since the Text taxeth only the time, but not the cause of it.

And for the instance of *Uzziab*, the Priests indeed withstood him, as they ought to have done, as the Ministers of the Gospel ought yet to do, if a King would go and consecrate the LORD'S Supper: but their withstanding of that, imports no violent Opposition; the strict signification of the word being only, that they *placed themselves over against him*, and so it is rendered by the *LXX. Interpreters*; and remember that *S. Paul withstood S. Peter to his face*, *Gal. 2. 11*. Yet I do not apprehend you will suspect he used force. As for what follows, that the Priests *did thrust him out*, it will not prove they laid hands on him, that word signifying only, that they made him haste out of the

Temple : and is the same word which *Esther* 6. 14. is rendered, *hasted*, where none will think that the Chamberlains laid violent hands on *Haman* : so all that the Priests did, was to charge *Uzziab*, when his Leprosie appeared, to get him quickly out of the Temple : and some Copies of the *LXX.* have it so rendered : and the following words shew there was no need of using force, since himself made haste. And for the word rendered *valiant*, or *sons of valor*, that word is not always taken for *valor*, but sometimes for *activity*; so *Gen.* 47. 6. sometimes for *riches*, so *Ruth* 2. 1. It is also rendered *wealth*, *Gen.* 34. 29. so this will not prove that *Azariab* made choice of these men for the strength of their Body, but for the Resolution of their Mind, that they might stoutly contradict *Uzziab*; and thus you have drawn a great deal more from me than I intended, or these misapplied places needed, for clearing of them from the design you had upon them.

Isot. But is it not clear from *1 Sam.* 14. 45. that *the people of Israel rescued Jonathan from his fathers bloody sentence against him, and swore he should not die*? See pag. 15.

Crit. That will prove as little; for no force was used in the matter, only a solemn Protestation was made. Next, the word rendered, *rescued*, is, *redeemed*, which is not used in a sense that

that imports violence in Scripture : but rather for a *thing done by contract and agreement* : And the *LXX. Interpreters* render it, *the people intreated for Jonathan* : nor need we doubt but *Saul* was easily prevailed upon to yield to their desire. Besides any King that would murder his eldest Son and heir of his Crown upon so bare a pretence, after he had signalized his courage so notably, as *Jonathan* did, may well be looked upon as one that is furious ; and so the holding of his hands, is very far different from the case of defensive Arms.

Isot. But *David*, a man according to *G O D S* heart, gathered four hundred Men about him, and stood to his defence, when cruelly persecuted by *Saul*,
1 *Sam.* 22. 2.

Basil. Many things meet in this instance to take away any colour of an argument might be drawn from it : for *David* was by *G O D S* command designed successor to the Crown, and so was no ordinary Subject. Next, *Saul* was become furious, and an evil spirit seized on him, so that in his rage he threw Javelins, not only at *David*, but at his Son *Jonathan*. Now all confess, that when a Sovereign is frenetick, his fury may be restrained. Further, we see how far *David* was from resistance, he standing on a pure defence, so that when he had *Saul* in his power twice, he would do him no hurt ; yea, *his heart*
smote

smote him when he cut off the hem of his garment, 1 Sam. 24. 4, 5. This was not like some you know of, who set Guards about their King (for the security of his Person forsooth) when he had trusted himself into their hands. And it is very doubtful if *David's* gathering that force about him was lawful; for these who came to him were naughty Men, and discontented and broken with debt; whereas had that been a justifiable practice, it is like he should have had another kind of following. And his offering his service to the *Philistins*, who were Enemies to GOD, to fight for them against the people of GOD, is a thing which can admit of no excuse. But after all this, if the actions even of renowned Persons in the Old Dispensation be Precedents, you may adduce the instances of *Ehud*, to prove that we may secretly assassinate a Tyrant; and of *Jael*, to prove that after we have offered protection to one who upon that trusts to us, we may secretly murder him.

Isot. But what say you to the resistance used by *Mattathias*, and his Children, who killed the Kings Officers, and armed against him? which resistance, as it was foretold by *Daniel*, so it is said by the Author of the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, That by faith they waxed valiant in fight, and turned to flight the Armies of Aliens: which by all is applied to the *Maccabees*. And who are

are you to condemn that which the holy Ghost calls *the work of faith* in them? See p. 18, 19.

Basil. I see *Criticus* is weary of speaking, and therefore will relieve him for this once, and tell you, that the title *Antiochus* had to command the *Jews*, is not undoubted: for *Josephus* lib. 12. cap. 7. and 8. shews how the *Jewish* Nation was tossed betwixt hands, and sometimes in the power of the Kings of *Egypt*, and sometimes of *Syria*; and that the factions among the *Jews*, gave the occasion to their being so invaded; for ambitious pretenders to the High Priesthood, sought the favour of these Kings, and so sacrificed the interests both of Religion, and their Country to their own base ends: which was the case in *Antiochus Epiphanes* his time, who after his attempt upon *Egypt*, came against *Jerusalem*, to which he was admitted by the men of his party, who opened the gates to him: after which, he polluted their worship and Temple, and fell on the cruellest persecution imaginable. Now his title over them being so ill grounded, their asserting their freedom and Religion against that cruel and unjust Invader, was not of the nature of Subjects resisting their Sovereign. Besides, what is brought from the *Epistle* to the *Hebrews* ch. 11. for justifying these Wars, seems ill applied: for from the end of the 32. verse, it appears he only speaks there of what was done

done in the times of the Prophets, and none of these being during the time of the *Maccabees*, that is not applicable to them. Next, as for *Matthias*, I must tell you that GOD often raised up extraordinary persons to judge *Israel*, whose practices must be no rule to us: for GOD sets up Kings and Rulers at his pleasure: and in the Old Dispensation he frequently sent extraordinary Persons to do extraordinary things, who were called *Zealots*: and such was *Samuel's* hewing *Agag* in pieces before the Lord, *Elijah's* causing to kill the Priests of *Baal*, which was not done upon the peoples power to kill Idolaters: but *Elijah* having by that signal Miracle of fire falling from heaven, proved both that GOD was the LORD, and onely to be worshiped, and that he was his Prophet, and commanding these Priests to be killed, he was to be obeyed. Of the same nature was his praying for fire from heaven on the Captains who came to take him, and *Elisha* his curling of the Children who reproached him. From these Precedents we see it is apparent that often in the Old Dispensation, the power of the Sword, both ordinary and extraordinary, was assumed by persons sent of GOD, which will never warrant private and ordinary uninspired Persons to do the like.

Isot. I acknowledg this hath some ground; but the first instance of these *Zealots*, was *Phinehas*;

in whom we find no vestige of an extraordinary mission, and yet he killed *Zimri* and *Cosbi*, for which he was rewarded with an everlasting Priesthood: So a zeal for GOD in extraordinary cases, seems warrant enough for extraordinary practices. *Pag. 382. to 405.*

Basil. If you will read the account of that action given by *Moses*, it will clear you of all your mistakes: since *Phinehas* had the warrant of the Magistrate for all he did; for *Moses* being then the Person in whose hands the Civil Power was committed by GOD, did say to the Judges of *Israel*, *Numb. 25. 5. Slay ye every one his men that were joyned to Baal Peor.* Now that *Phinehas* was a Judge in *Israel* at that time, is not to be doubted; for *Eleazer* was then High Priest, and by that means exempted from that Authority, which when his Father *Aaron* lived, was in his hand, *Numb. 3. 32.* and he being now in his Fathers place, there is no ground to doubt but *Phinehas* was also in his, and so as one of the Judges, he had received command from *Moses* to execute judgment on these impure Idolaters, which he did with so much noble zeal, that the Plague was stayed, and GOD'S wrath turned away. But if this conclude a Precedent, it will prove too much, both that a Church-man may execute judgment, and that a private person in the sight of a holy Magistrate, without wait-
ing

ing for his Justice, may go and punish Crimes. From the instances adduced, it will appear how *Zealots* were ordinarily raised up in that Dispensation: But when two of **CHRISTS** Disciples lay claim to that priviledg of praying for fire from heaven, he gives check to the fervor of their thundring zeal, and tells them, *Luk. 9. 55, 56. You know not what spirit you are of: adding, that the Son of man was not come to destroy mens lives, but to save them:* whereby he shews that tho in the Old Dispensation, **GOD** having by his own command given his people a title to invade the Nations of *Canaan*, and extirpate them, having also given them Political Laws for the administration of Justice, and order among them, it was proper for that time that **G O D** should raise up Judges to work extraordinary deliverances to his People, whose Example we are not now to imitate: **G O D** also sent Prophets, who had it sometimes in Commission to execute Justice on Transgressors; yet in the New Dispensation, these things were not to take place, where we have no temporal *Canaan*, nor Judicial Laws given us; and consequently none are now extraordinarily called in the Name of **G O D**, to inflict ordinary and corporal punishments.

Having said all this, it will be no hard task to make it appear that *Mattathias* was a Person extraordinarily raised up by **G O D**, as were the

Judges.

Judges. And though no mention of that be made, neither by *Josephus*, nor the Book of *Maccabees*, that is not to be stood upon; for we have many of the Judges of *Israel*, of whose call no account is given, and yet undoubtedly they were warranted to act as they did, otherwise they had been Invaders. But if that practice of *Mattathias* conclude any thing by way of Precedent, it will prove that Church-men may invade the Magistrates Office, and kill his Officers, and raise War against him.

Crit. I wonder we hear not *Isotimus* alledging the practice of the ten Tribes, who rejected *Rehoboam*, and made choice of *Jeroboam*, which useth to be very confidently adduced, for proving it to be the peoples right to give Laws to their Princes, and to shake them off when they refuse obedience to their desires. But to this and all other instances of this nature, it is to be answered, that the Jewish State being a *Theocracy*, as it is called by their own Writers, their Judges, and many of their Kings had their title from GOD's designation, and the possession was only yielded to them by the People, according to the command, *Deut. 17. 15. To set him King over them whom the LORD their GOD did chuse*: So when they sought a King, they came to *Samuel*, as the known Prophet of GOD, and desired him to give them a King, which he after-

afterwards did. In like manner was *David* designed to succeed *Saul*, by the same Prophet; and upon *Saul's* death, the Tribe of *Judab* came and acknowledged, and anointed him King, which was the solemn investiture in that to which he had formerly a right.

Jeroboam being by the same authority designed King over the ten Tribes by the mouth of *Abijah* in the name of GOD, 1 Kings 11. Ch. from v. 28. he derived his Title from that: and there was as good warrants for the people to reject *Reboam*, and follow him, as was formerly to quite *Ishbosheth*, and follow *David*.

Another instance of this nature is *Elisha* his sending one to *Jehu*, where that young Prophet saith, 2 Kings 9. 6. *Thus saith the LORD GOD of Israel, I have anointed thee King over the people of the LORD, even over Israel: Upon the notice whereof, v. 13. he is declared King.* These instances will sufficiently prove what I have alledged, that the Kings of the *Hebrews* having their right from G O D, were to be changed when the most High *who ruleth in the Kingdom of men and giveth it to whomsoever he will, and setteth up over it the basest of men,* interposed his authority and command. One word more, and I have done. When the Law of the Judge is set down, Deut. 17. 12. all who do presumptuously, and hearkened not unto the Judge, are senten-

sentenced to death, *That evil might be put away from Israel, whereby the people might hear, and fear, and do no more presumptuously.* This shews that absolute Submission was due to the Judges, under the pain of death; whereby all private mens judging of their Sentence is struck out. It is true the other Laws that prefer the Commands of G O D to the Laws of men, do necessarily suppose the exception of unlawful Commands: but since no Law warrants the resisting their Sentence, it will clearly follow that absolute Submission was due to these Judges.

Basil. Truly these things as they seem to be well made out from Scripture, so they stand with Reason, since no order can be expected among men, unless there be an uncontrollable Tribunal on Earth. Our Consciences are indeed only within G O D'S Jurisdiction: but if there be not a Supreme Power to cognosce and determine about our Actions, there must follow endless Confusions, when any number of People can be got to mutiny against Laws: therefore there must be a Supreme Court. But the Laws and settled Practices of Kingdoms, must determine in whose Person this lies, whether in a single Person, the Nobility, or the Major part of the People? Yet I desire to hear what decisions the *New Testament* offers in this Question.

Crit. Truly that will be soon dispatched; consider then how our *L O R D*, *Matth. 5.* forbids us to *resist evil*; where it is true, he enumerates only small Injuries: so I shall not deny but that place will amount no farther, than that we ought to bear small Injuries, rather than revenge or oppose them; but you must yield to the doctrine of Submission, if afterwards you consider how our *L O R D* tells us, *Matth. 11. 20.* *To learn of him, for he was meek*; and that he condemns the thundering fervor of his Disciples, who called for fire from Heaven, shewing the nature of the New Dispensation to be quite different from the Old, in that particularly, that *the Son of man came not to destroy mens lives, but to save them*: And chiefly that when he was to give the greatest instance wherein we should imitate him, he refused the defence of the Sword, and commanded *S. Peter to put up his sword*, *Matth. 26. 52.*

Isot. If you urge this too much, then must I answer, that by the same Consequence you may prove we must cast our selves on dangers, and not flee from them: since we find *CHRIST* going up to *Jerusalem*, though he knew what was abiding him there: neither did he fly, which yet himself allowed. Besides, you may as well urge against all Prayer to *G O D* for deliverance, his not praying for Angels to assist him.

But

But the clear account of this is given by himself, that the Scriptures were to be fulfilled which fore-told his death. See pag. 24. and Answer to the Letter about *Jus populi*.

Crit. I must confess my self amazed at this Answer, when I find S. Peter saying expressly, 1 Pet. 2. 21. *That CHRIST suffered, leaving us an example that we might follow his steps*; and applying this to the very Case of suffering wrongfully; and that notwithstanding of that, you should study to pervert the Scripture so grossly besides: consider that CHRIST was to fulfil all righteousness; if then the Laws of Nature exact our defence in case of unjust Persecution for Religion, he was bound to that Law as well as we; *For he came not to destroy, but to fulfil the Law*, both by his Example and Precepts. If then you charge the Doctrine of Absolute Submission, as brutish and stupid, see you do not run into blasphemy, by charging that Holy One foolishly: for whatever he knew of the secret Will of GOD, he was to follow his revealed Will in his Actions, whereby he might be a perfect Pattern to all his followers: for GOD'S revealed Will was his Rule, as well as ours. But I dwell too long on things that are clear. As for your Instances, they will serve you in no stead. For his coming to *Jerusalem* was a duty, all the Males being bound to appear three times a year before

the Lord at *Jerusalem*, at the three Festivals, the Pasover being the first of them, *Deut. 16*. And this being a duty, our LORD was to perform it, what ever hazard might follow. So we find *S. Paul* on a less obligation, going to *Jerusalem*, notwithstanding the bonds were fore-told to abide him there. And as for your other pretended Consequence against Prayer, from his not praying for legions of Angels, it bewrays great Inadvertency: for you find our LORD a few minutes before, praying in the Garden, *Matth. 26. 42.* over and over again, that if it were possible that cup might pass from him. And there is our warrant from his Practice, to pray for a deliverance from Troubles or Persecutions, if it may stand with the holy will of GOD: But for a miraculous deliverance by the ministry of Angels, that our Lord would not pray for, lest thereby the Prophecies should not be accomplished: and by this, our praying for a miraculous Deliverance, is indeed from his example condemned: but still we are to pray, that if it be possible, and according to the Will of GOD, any bitter cup is put in our hands, may pass from us. Next, let me desire you to consider the reason given *S. Peter* for putting up his Sword, *Matth. 26. 52.* *For they that take the sword, shall perish by the sword.*

Isot. You misapply this place palpably, it not being

being designed as a threatning against S. Peter, but for the encouragement of his Disciples, and being indeed a Propheſie that the *Jews* who now come against him with Swords and Staves, should perish by the sword of the *Romans*, who should be the avengers of CHRIST'S death. See page 25.

Crit. You are beholden to *Grotius* for this Exposition, who is the first of the latter Writers that hath given that sense to these words, tho he voucheth for his opinion some elder Writers; and he designing to prove that a private Person may resist another private Assaillant by force, being a little pinch'd with this place, which seems to condemn simply the use of the Sword, escapes out of it by the answer you have adduced. But though this were the genuine scope of these words, still remember that our *L O R D* rejects the use of the Sword for his defence: and if his fore-telling the Destruction of the *Jews*, was of force to bind up S. Peter's hands, why should not also that general promise, *Rev. 13. 10.* *He that killeth with the sword, must be killed by the sword*, also secure our Fears, and sheath our Swords, and the rather that it is there subjoined, *Here is the faith and patience of the Saints?* Which seems to imply, that since retaliation will be given out by God upon unjust Murderers, therefore Faith and Patience must be the Exercise

of the Saints, which to all unprejudged Minds, will sound a discharge of the use of Weapons of War. But after all this, the phrase of *taking the sword*, seems only applicable to *S. Peter*; for the Band being sent out by a Magistrate, could not properly be said to have taken the Sword, it being put in their hands by these who were invested with it, though they now tyrannically abuse their power: but the phrase agrees much better with *S. Peter's* drawing it, who had no warrant for it, and so did indeed take it. Next, we hear no mention of the Band of Soldiers their using their Swords; therefore this Prediction seems fitted for *S. Peter*, and all such as mistaking the nature of the Christian Dispensation, do take the Sword. But next, consider CHRIST'S words to *Pilate*, *John 18. 36.* *My Kingdom is not of this world: if my Kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews; but now is my Kingdom not from hence.* And this being said upon the Accusation the Jews had given against him to *Pilate*, that he call'd himself a King, charging him upon his friendship to *Cesar*, to put him to death, CHRIST'S answer shews that earthly Kings need apprehend no prejudice from his Kingdom, since it not being about worldly things, was not to be fought for.

Isot. Speak plainly, do you mean by this that

that CHRIST should have no Kingdom upon Earth? which I fear too many of you desire, since you press this so warmly. But consider you not that by this CHRIST only means he was not to set up a Temporal Dominion upon Earth, to juggle Cesar from his Throne, such as the *Jews* expected from their *Messiah*; and therefore this place is indeed strong against the pretences of some Carnal *Fifth-Monarchy Men*, but is ill adduced to condemn defence, when we are unjustly assaulted by a persecuting Tyrant. See p. 25.

Crit. It is no new thing to find the sincere Doctrine of the Gospel misrepresented by Sons of *Belial*; but learn the difference betwixt a Kingdom of the World, and in the World, and so temper your Passion. CHRIST must have a Kingdom in the World, but not of it. And the greatest hazard of a pretending King, being the raising of Wars and Commotions upon his Title, CHRIST'S words are not truly commented on by the practice of his Servants, unless they secure Princes from their Fears of their raising Wars upon his Title: Therefore as the fighting at that time, for preserving CHRIST from the *Jews*, had been contrary to the nature of his Spiritual Kingdom; so the Rule of the Gospel binding all the succeeding Ages of the Church, no less than these to whom it was first delivered,

what was then contrary to the nature of CHRIST'S Kingdom, will be so still. And to this I might add the Doctrine of Peace so much insisted on in the *New Testament*. it being the Legacy CHRIST left to his Disciples, which we are commanded to *follow with all men, as much as is possible, and as in us lies.* And if with all men, sure much more with the Magistrate. And S. Paul's words in the xiii. to the *Romans* are so express, that methinks they should strike a terror in all men from resisting the Superior Powers, lest they *resist the ordinance of G O D, and receive damnation.* And it is observable, that S. Paul, who, as a Zealot, had formerly persecuted the Christians, doth now so directly contradict that Doctrine, which was at that time so horridly corrupted among the *Jews*. This place is so express, that it needs not the advantages may be given to it, either from the consideration of the power the *Roman* Empire had usurped over the World, or from the Emperor who then reigned, who must have been either *Claudius* or *Nero*: and if the former, we find, *Acts* 18. 2. that *he banished all the Jews from Rome,* and with them the Christians, not being distinguish'd by the *Romans* from the *Jews*, were also banished: and here was a driving of Christians from *Rome*, which you will not deny to have been a Persecution. But if it was *Nero*,
we

we know very well how the Christians were used by him. But these words of *S. Paul* being as at first addressed to the *Romans*, so also designed by the holy Ghost to be a part of the Rule of all Christians, do prove, that whoever hath the Supreme Power, is to be submitted to, and never resisted.

Isot. If you were not in too great a haste, you would not be so forward, consider therefore the reason *S. Paul* gives for submission to Superior Rulers, is, *because they are the Ministers of GOD for good.* If then they swerve from this, they forsake the end for which they are raised up, and so fall from their power and right to our obedience.

Basil. Truly what you have said makes me not repent of any haste I seemed to make; for what you have alledged proves indeed that the Sovereign is a Minister of *G O D* for good, so that he corrupts his power grossly when he pursues not that design: but in that he is only accountable to *G O D*, whose Minister he is. And this must hold good, except you give us good ground to believe that *G O D* hath given authority to the Subjects to call him to account for his trust; but if that be not made appear, then he must be left to *G O D*, who did empower him, and therefore can only coerce him. As one having his power from a King, is count-
able

able to none for the administration of it, but to the King, or to these on whom the King shall devolve it : so except it be proved, that G O D hath warranted Subjects to call their Sovereigns to account, they being his Ministers, must only be answerable to him. And according to these Principles of yours, the Magistrate's authority shall be so enervated, that he shall no more be able to serve these designs, for which G O D hath vested him with Power : every one being thus taught to shake off his Yoak when they think he acts in prejudice of Religion. And here I shall add one thing which all *Casuits* hold a safe Rule in matters that are doubtful, that we ought to follow that side of the doubt which is freest of hazard ; here then damnation is at least the seeming hazard of resistance ; therefore except upon as clear evidence you prove the danger of absolute submission to be of the same nature that it may ballance the other ; then absolute submission, as being the securest, is to be followed. Next, we find Saint *Peter*, 1 *Pet.* 2. 13, &c. who being yet infected with the spirit of a *Jewish* zealot, had drawn the Sword ; afterwards when indued with power from on High, at length pressing the doctrine of Obedience adding that the pretence of the Christian freedom should not be made a Cloak of malicioufness. And this submission he re-

com-

commends not only to Subjects, whose obedience was more easie, but to servants who were under a heavier Yoak, according to the Laws of servitude, both among the *Jews* and the *Romans*: and he tells them, That *when they did well, and suffered for it, and took it patiently, that was acceptable*. Withal adding, *For even hereunto were you called; because CHRIST also suffered for us, leaving us an example, that we should follow his steps*. Further, it is to be considered how the *Jews* did upon the first preaching of the Gospel persecute the Christians every where: *S. Stephen* was stoned, and *Saul* got Commissions for making havock of the Church: but because this was done by the authority of the *Sanhedrim*, no resistance was made them, though since at two Sermons we hear of 8000 Converts, we may be induced to believe their number was great. And from hence subsume that the case of persecution being then not only imminent, but also present (besides the grievous persecutions were abiding the Churches for three Centuries) it must be confessed to be strange, that the matter of resistance being at least so dubious, no decision should be given about it in the *New Testament*; nothing being alledged from it that hath any aspect that way. And indeed I cannot conceal my wonder at them who plead so much the authority and fulness of Scripture, to reach even
the

the rituals of Worship and Government, and yet in so great a matter adventure on a practice without its warrant. Truly *Isotimus*, if these things prevail not with you, beyond your little small shufflings, I doubt it is because you have lost the Standard to measure Reason by, and have given up your Judgment to your passions and interests.

Isot. I am far from denying the Doctrine of the Cross to be a great part of these duties we are bound to in the Gospel; but this must not be stretched too far, lest it infer an obligation on us to submit to a foreign Prince, the *Turk*, or any other, if he come by force to impose on us the *Alcoran*, under a pretence of suffering for Religion. See pag. 27, and 28.

Basil. Truly when I hear how much weight is laid on what you have now said, as if it amounted to a demonstration against all hath been hitherto adduced; I am in doubt whether to pity their weakness, or blame their perverseness, who dare adventure on that, the punishment whereof the holy Ghost hath made damnation, upon such mistakes: for God hath put the Sword in their hands who have the Sovereign Power, which they bear not in vain; for they are the *Ministers of God, and his Revengers, to execute wrath on him that doth evil*: The Magistrates then are both by the Laws of God, and of all Nations,

Nations, the Protectors of their Subjects, and therefore Tributes and Customs are due to them, for defraying the expence to which that must put them; and Prayers are to be offered up for them, that *we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty*. If then a forein Prince invade a Country, under whatever pretence, the Sovereign is bound to defend his Subjects, with the Sword *GOD* hath put in his hand, which comes to be a most lawful War on his side; nay such, as he were a betrayer of his trust, if he omitted it.

Isot. But what if our Prince should consent to such an Invasion, and expose his Subjects to be a prey to such an Invader, must they look on and see themselves destroyed, upon the pretence that *GOD* hath not put the Sword in their hands, and therefore they must not take it; and because Christ's Kingdom is not of this World, therefore they must not fight for him?

Basil. You suppose a Case not like to fall out in haste; but were it real, that Invader having no Title to that peoples obedience, they may make use of the right of Nature which allows to one out of a Society forcible self-defence, if violently assaulted: and therefore such hostile invasion, be it upon what pretence soever, may be as lawfully resisted, as one private Man may resist another in his own defence, if he threaten to kill him,

him, unless he renounce GOD. If then one Man may resist another, so may more men resist a great force coming against them: for to us who live here, the *Grand Seignior* is but a fellow of our nature, and hath no right over us, no more than one private person hath over his Neighbour. And if you do not acknowledg a great difference betwixt such an asserting of our Liberties, from one that hath no Title to them, and the resisting of a lawful Magistrate, though unjustly persecuting his Subjects, you must be set to your horned book again.

Isot. But at least you will confess that private Men living in a settled Society, have no title to the Sword, according to your Principles; must we then yield out Throats to a Robber that assaults us on the High-way? Or to come nearer you, if one threaten to kill us, if we yield not to their Religion, must we give way to their fury?

Basil. Remember still how I told you, that Men living out of Societies have a right to self-defence, and when they come under Societies, they retain all their former rights, such only excepted as are by the laws of the Society judged inconsistent with its order and peace: therefore resisting of the Supreme Powers, or those having their authority, being only discharged, the right of self-defence against equals still remains
intire,

intire, so that a private person may claim it or not, as he will : and therefore in the case of such an Aggressor, the Laws of Nature and Nations do warrant me to use force when assaulted ; yet if a greater consideration appear, and it be evident that my giving way to such unjust force will be more for the honour of the Gospel, if I resist, I do not sin, but do well ; but if I resist not, certainly I do better.

End. I have been a witness to this Discourse, not without much pleasure, and do acknowledge my self fully convinced of the necessity of obedience, and submission to the Supreme Power, since without that be once established, as the foundation of Societies, I see not what peace or order can be looked for, but every one will take on him to judge the Law-giver : and if he have so much power or policy as to make a party, he will never want pretences, chiefly about Religion, considering in how many various opinions the Christian world hath divided about it. And it is a poor Answer to say, it must be the true Religion that we should defend, since it is to be supposed every one judgeth the Religion he is of to be the true one : If then according to that Doctrine, Religion be to be defended ; certainly though the Religion be wrong, yet every one oppressed in his Conscience, and judging it to be according to truth, is bound to defend

defend it ; since even an erring conscience doth at least tie, if not oblige. For the common resolution of *Casuits* being that a Man under an erroneous Conscience, is yet to follow its dictates, though he sin by so doing : then all parties that are oppressed, ought to vindicate what they judg to be the truth of GOD. And by this you may see to what a fair pass the peace of mankind is brought by these Opinions.

But mistake me not, as if I were here pleading for submission, to patronize the tyranny or cruelty of persecuting Princes, who shall answer to God for that great trust deposited in their hands ; which if they transgress, they have a dear account to make to him *who sits in heaven and laughs at the raging and consultings of these Kings or Princes, who design to throw off his Yoak, or burst his bonds in sunder. He who hath set his King upon his holy Hill of Zion, shall rule them with a rod of Iron, and break them in pieces as a Potter's Vessel.* And he to whom vengeance doth belong, will avenge himself of all the injuries they do his truths, or followers : but as they sin against him, so they are only countable to him.

Yet I need not add what hath been often said, that it is not the name of a King, or the ceremonies of a Coronation, that cloaths one with the Sovereign Power ; since I know there are, and have been titular Kings, who are indeed but the
first

first Persons of the State, and only Administrators of the Laws, the Sovereign Power lying in some Assembly of the Nobility, and States, to whom they are accountable. In which Case, that Court to whom these Kings must give account, is the Supreme Judicatory of the Kingdom, and the King is but a Subject.

Ifot. But doth not the Coronation of a King, together with his Oath given, and the consent of the People demanded at it, prove him to have his Power upon the Conditions in that Oath? And these Oaths being mutually given, his Coronation Oath first, and the Oath of Allegiance next, do shew it is a Compact; and in all mutual Agreements, the nature of Compacts is, that the one party breaking, the other is also free. Further, Kings who are tied up, so that they cannot make, nor repeal Laws, nor impose Taxes without the consent of the States of their Kingdom, shew their Power to be limited, and that at least such Assemblies of the States share with them in the Sovereign Power, which is at large made out by *Jus populi*.

Basil. It is certain there cannot be two co-ordinate Powers in a Kingdom; for no man can serve two Masters: therefore such an Assembly of the States must either be Sovereign or subject; for a middle there is not. As for the Coronation of Princes, it is like enough that at

first it was the formal giving their Power to them; and the old Ceremonies yet observ'd in it, prove it hath been at first so among us: But it being a thing clear in our Law, that the King never dies, his Heir coming in his place the very moment he expires, so that he is to be obeyed before his Coronation, as well as after; and that the Coronation is nothing but the solemn inaugurating in the Authority which the King possessed from his Father's death, shews, that any Ceremonies may be used in it, whatever the original of them may have been, do not subject his Title to the Crown to the Peoples consent. And therefore his Coronation Oath is not the condition upon which he gets his Power, since he possess'd that before; nor is it upon that Title that he exacts the Oath of Allegiance, which he likewise exacted before his Coronation. This being the practice of a Kingdom passed all Prescription, proves the Coronation to be no compact betwixt the King and his Subjects: And therefore he is indeed bound by his Coronation Oath to *God*, who will be avenged on him, if he break it, so the matter of it were lawful: but the breaking of it cannot forfeit a prior Right he had to the Peoples Obedience. And as for the limitations Kings have consented to pass on their own Power, that they may act nothing but in such a form of Law, these
being

being either the King's free Concessions to the People, or restraints arising from some Rebelions, which extorted such Priviledges, will never prove the King a Subject to such a Court, unless by the clear Laws and Practices of that Kingdom, it be so provided, that if he do mal-verse, he may be punished ; which when made appear, proves that Court to have the Sovereign Power : and that never weakens my design, that Subjects ought not to resist their Sovereign.

Philar. You have dwelt, methinks, too long on this, though considering the nature of the thing, it deserves indeed an exact discussion : yet this whole Doctrine appears so clear to a discerning Mind, that I cannot imagine whence all the mist is raised about it can spring, except from the corrupt Passions or Lusts of men, which are subtle enough to invent excuses, and fair colors, for the blackest of Crimes. And the smoak of the bottomless pit may have its share, in occasioning the darkness is raised about that, which by the help of the light of *God*, or of reason, stands so clear and obvious. But when I consider the instances of sufferings under both Dispensations, I cannot see how any should escape the force of so much evident proof as hangs about this opinion. And if it had been the Peoples duty to have reformed by the force of Arms under the Old Dispensation, so that it

was a base and servile Compliance with the Tyranny and Idolatry of their Kings, not to have resisted their subverting of Religion, and setting up of Idolatry, where was then the fidelity of the Prophets, who were *to lift up their voices as Trumpets, and to shew the house of Jacob their iniquities?* And since the watch-man who gave not warning to the wicked from his wicked way, was guilty of his Blood, I see not what will excuse the silence of the Prophets in this, if it was the Peoples duty to reform: For it is a poor refuge to say, because the People were so much inclin'd to Idolatry, that therefore it was in vain to exhort them to reform; (*See pag. 10, 11.*) since by that Argument you may as well conclude it to have been needless to have exhorted their Kings to Reformation, their inclination to Idolatry being so strong: but their duty was to be discharged, how small soever the likelihood was of the Peoples yielding obedience to their warnings. If then it was the Peoples duty to reform, the omission of it was undoubtedly a Sin; how then comes it that they who had it in commission to *cause Jerusalem to know her abominations*, under so severe a Certificate, do never charge the People for not going about a popular Reformation, nor coercing these wicked Kings who enacted so much Idolatry, backing it with such Tyranny, nor ever require them

to set about it? I know one hath pick'd out some Expressions, (*See Answer to the Letter to the Author of Jus populi*) which to his thoughts sound that way: but truly they are so remote from the sense he stretches them to, that I should wonder much at his Glosses, did I not know that the Bell seems often to ring the hearer's fancy. From these, let us pass to the instances of the first Christians, who endured the sharpest Persecutions with the greatest patience.

Polyb. Here is a large Theme for much discourse, if I should adduce all might be said on this head. Indeed the Persecutions the Christians groaned under for three hundred years, are such, that scarce can they be read without horror; the last especially, which continued for about twenty years under *Dioclesian*, and his Colleagues and Successors; and by the number that suffered, we may easily guess what the strength of the Christians was. But this can be doubted by none who have ever looked upon History. *Pliny lib. 10. Ep. 97.* writes to *Trajan* (which is reckoned to have been the 104. year of Christ) that in *Pontus* and *Bitbynia*, where he was then Proconsul, there were many Christians of all Ages, Ranks and Sexes: and that not only in the Cities, but through the Villages and Country Places: that the Temples were almost desolate, the Sacrifices long intermitted,

and that none almost were found to buy the Victims. The number of the Christians being so early risen to that height, we may easily imagine to what it swelled before *Constantine's* times: not long after that, we find a whole Legion of *Marcus Aurelius* his Army to have been Christians. And if we believe *Tertullian*, their numbers were formidable in his time; for after he had purged the Christians of his times from the designs of doing mischief to their Enemies by stealth, he adds, *Apol. cap. 37.* Should we carry towards you not as secret avengers, but as open enemies, would we want the strength of numbers and armies? Are the Maurs, the Marcomans, or the Parthians themselves, or any Nations shut up within their own Country or bounds, more than the whole World? We are strangers to you, and yet we fill all your places, your Towns, your Islands, your Castles, your Villages, your Councils, your Camps, your Tribes, your Decuries, your Palaces, your Senate, and your Market place: Only we come not to your Temples, but abandon those to you. To what War had we not been both fit and ready, even tho our Forces had been fewer, who are butcher'd so willingly, if our Discipline did not allow us rather to be killed than to kill? And he goes on, telling that such was the number of the Christians, that would they but change their dwellings, and leave the Roman Empire, it would have thereby become an amazing Solitude,

Solitude, since almost all their Citizens were Christians. And the same writer saith elsewhere, ad Scap. cap. 2. That tho the Romans who were Idolaters, were found guilty of many Conspiracies against their Emperors, yet never were any Christians found guilty of these Practices. And adds, That a Christian was no mans enemy, much less the Emperors; but knowing him to be constituted by God, he doth find himself bound to love, reverence, honor, and wish well to him, with the whole Roman Empire, as long as the World lasts. Therefore, saith he, We worship the Emperor so as befits him, and is lawful for us, as a man next God, who hath obtained all he hath from GOD, and is inferior to none, but God only. And a little after, Cap. 5. he tells us of the numbers of the Christians, and how undaunted they were at the Persecution; so that when one Arrius Antoninus in Asia, was persecuting the Christians, the whole City ran to his Tribunal, declaring themselves Christians. And he adds, If the like were to be done at Carthage, what would become of all the thousands were there, of every Sex, Age and Rank? From this we may guess both of the strength and numbers of the Christians of that time, and yet there was not the least inclination among them to resistance. If any doubt the truth of what Tertullian saith, as is p. 30. he must charge him with very much Impudence, who durst offer such writings to the Heathens, in matters of

fact, which could not but be notoriously enough known : Neither do I adduce these places, because I lay so much weight on *Tertullian's* opinion in this matter, but because he shews us what was the sense of the Christians of his time. A little after him *Cyprian* lived, who also tells us, *ad Demetrianum*, That none of the Christians when apprehended, struggled with those who seized on them, nor avenged themselves of that injustice, though their number was great and copious : But their belief of the Vengeance should follow on their Persecutors, made them patient, so that the Innocent yielded to the Guilty. And we may judge of the number of the Christians of that Age, by what *Cornelius* who was Bishop of Rome, anno 254. in *Euseb.* 6. Book, cap. 43. tells of the State of the Roman Clergy in his time, how there were in it 46 Presbyters, 7 Deacons, 42 Acolyths, 52 Exorcists, Lectors and Porters, and of Widows and poor Persons 1500, and where so many Poor were maintain'd, you must confess the number of the Christians was very great. But if we go to *Dioclesian's* time, we find the number of the Christians incredible ; and the Cruelties used against them to have been such, that Hell could devise nothing beyond them. Some were burnt alive, others had boiling Lead poured on them, others had their flesh and joints torn off them by burning Pincers, others

others were broken to pieces, others stretched all out of joint, others hanged up by the Thumbs and cut in slices, others hanged up by the heels. And this was universal through the whole Empire, and to such a degree, that it continued for many years; and in *Egypt* alone they were often killed by hundreds a day, as *Eusebius* tells, who was a witness to much of it. And *Godean* reckons, that in one month there were seventeen thousand Martyrs killed: and during that persecution in the Province of *Egypt*, there were an hundred forty and four thousand, who died by the violence of their Persecutors, and seven hundred thousand who died through the fatigues of Banishment, or of the publick works, to which they were condemned. I had almost forgot one sort of persecution, which as it was the most dreaded, so hath in it that which could not but provoke all to the utmost of horror and despair, which was the prostituting of their Virgins, more dreaded than any death. But among all these vast numbers, none offered to resist with the Sword: and yet they were so marvellously assisted by God, that in their sufferings they expressed the greatest joy in God, by their Hymns and Psalms, and the most of mildness to their Persecutors. And dare you say, *Isotimus*, that these were a stupid self-murdering Crew? Or do you think that had they been guilty of such a Crime,

a Crime, as you seem to fasten on the Doctrine of absolute submission; God had appeared for them in such a signal manner, to the conviction and horror of their Persecutors?

I confess there is no piece of Story I read with such pleasure as the accounts are given of these Martyrs; for methinks they leave a fervor upon my mind, which I meet with in no study, that of the Scriptures being only excepted. Say not then they were not able to have stood to their own defence, when it appears how great their numbers were: Or shall I here tell you the known Story of the *Thebean Legion*, which consisted of 6666. who being by *Maximinus Hercules*, an. 287. pressed in the Oath they gave the Emperor to swear upon the Altars of the Idols, withdrew from the Camp eight miles off; and when he sent to invite them to come and swear as the others had done; they who commanded them answered in all their names, *That they were ready to return and fight stoutly against the Barbarians; but that being Christians, they would never worship the Gods.* Whereupon the Emperor caused tith them, which they received with such joy, that every one desired the lot might fall on himself. And this prevailing nothing on them, he tithed them a second time; and that being also without effect, he caused to murder them all, to which they submitted with-

without resistance. And it is not to be denied, but such a number being driven to such despair, and having so much courage as to dare to die in cold blood, might have stood to their defence a great while, and at least sold their lives at a dear rate, especially they having got off eight miles from the Army.

Were it my design to back these instances with the great authorities of the most eminent Writers of the Church in these times, I should grow too tedious: but this is so far from being denied, that the only way to escape so strong an assault, is to study to detract from these holy Men by enquiring into any over-reachings, to which their fervor might have engaged them.

Isot. All their practices are not binding upon us, for many of them did precipitate themselves into hazards, others were against flight, & others against resisting of private assailants, who without warrant came to murder them; therefore the Spirit that acted in them, tho it produced effects highly to the honour of the Gospel, is not to be imitated by us: yet on the other hand, I acknowledge we ought to be slow to judg them. One thing is observable, that *Maximinus* was resisted by the *Armenians*, when he intended to set up Idolatry among them. *Constantine* also invaded *Licinius* when he persecuted the Christians in the *East*: and the *Persians*, when persecuted
by

by their King, implored the help of the *Roman* Emperor. Besides, I have seen a Catalogue of many instances of resistance used in some Cities, when their good Bishops were forced away from them, which shews they were not so stupid as you design to represent them. See pag. 29, &c. and *Jus populi* at length.

Basil. It is certain all Christians have one Law and Rule; and the Laws of Nature are eternal and irreversibile: if then the Law of Nature engage us to self-defence, it laid the same ties on them: therefore except you turn *Enthusiast*, you must say, that what is a Duty, or a sin now, was so then likewise; and so you must either charge that *Cloud of Witnesses* with brutish stupidity, or otherwise accuse our late forwardness of unjust resistance, since one Rule was given to both; and contradicting practices can never be adjusted to the same Rule. And for these invidious aspersions you would fasten on them, as if they had not understood their own Liberties, they are but poor escapes; for it being already made out that violent resistance even of an equal, is not a Law, but a right of Nature; if they thought it more for the glory of the Gospel to yield even to private injuries, who are we to tax them for it? But for flying from the Persecutors, it is true *Tertullian* condemned it, but that was neither the opinion nor practice of the Christians in these Ages. As

As for what you alledg about the resistance made by the *Armenians* to *Maximinus*, I wish your friend had vouched his Author for what he saith of them; for I am confident he is not so impudent as to prove a matter of fact done twelve Ages ago, by a Writer of this Age. All I can meet with about that, is from *Eusebius*, lib. 9. cap. 6. who tells, *That in these times the Tyrant made War against the Armenians (men that had been of old Friends and Auxiliaries to the Romans) whom because they were Christians, and were pious, and zealously studious about divine matters, that hatred of GOD, intending to force to worship the false Gods and Devils, made to become Enemies instead of Friends, and Adversaries instead of Auxiliaries.* And in the beginning of the next Chapter, he tells how in that War he and his Army received a great defeat. Now how you will infer from this, that Subjects may resist their Sovereign for Religion, I see not: for these *Armenians* were his Confederates, and not his Subjects: and it is clear by the account *Eusebius* gives, that *Armenia* was not a Province, nor governed by a Prefect, as were the Provinces. Besides, consider how *Maximinus* came in the sag-end of that great persecution begun by *Dioclesian* and *Herculius*, continued by *Galerius*, and consummated by *Maximinus* himself, in which for all the numbers of the Martyrs, and the cruelty of
the

the Persecution, there was not so much as a Tumult: which makes it evident the Christians at that time understood not the Doctrine of Resistance. But the *Armenians* case varying from that of Subjects, it was free for them to resist an unjust Invader, who had no Title to their Obedience.

For your Story of *Licinius*, the true account of it will clear mistakes best (*as it is given by Euf. 10. cap. 5.*) *Constantine* after he turned Christian, being then Emperor of the *West*, called for *Licinius*, whom *Galerius* had made Emperor in the *East*, and they both from *Millain* gave out Edicts in favour of the Christians, giving them absolute liberty, and discharging all persecution on that account, which is reckoned to have been in the year 313. afterwards he allied with *Licinius*, and gave him his Sister in marriage, and acknowledged him his Colleague in the Empire. But some years after that Wars arose betwixt them, which *Zosimus* and *Eutropius* impute to *Constantine's* ambition, and impatience of a Rival: but if we believe the account *Eusebius* gives of it, *Licinius* provoked with envy at *Constantine*, and forgetting the Laws of Nature, the bonds of Oaths, alliance and agreement, raised a pestiferous and cruel War against him, and laid many designs and snares for his destruction, which he attempted long by secret and fraudulent ways, but these

these were always by GOD's Providence discovered, and so *Constantine* escaped all his designed mischief: At length *Licinius* finding his secret Arts did not succeed, he openly made War against *Constantine*. And as he was preparing for it, he made War likewise against GOD, and persecuted the Christians, because he apprehended they all prayed for *Constantine*, and wished him success; whereupon he made severe Laws against the Christians, forbidding the Bishops ever to meet among themselves, or to instruct any Women: afterwards he banished all that would not worship the Gods, and from that he went to an open Persecution; and not content with that, he by severe Laws discharged any to visit and relieve such as were in Prison for the Faith. Yet notwithstanding all this, none that were under his part of the Empire did resist him; nay, not so much as turn over to *Constantine* against him, for ought that appears: But upon these things a War followed betwixt *Constantine* and him, wherein *Licinius* was defeated, and forced to submit to what conditions *Constantine* was pleased to give; who took from him *Greece* and *Illyricum*, and only left him *Thrace*, and the *East*. But *Licinius* returning to his old ways, and breaking all agreements, a second war followed, wherein *Licinius* was utterly defeated, and sent to lead a private life at *Thessalonica*, where he was
some-

sometime after that killed, because of new designs against *Constantine*. This being the true account of that Story, I am to divine what advantage it can yield to the cause of Subjects resisting their Sovereign; for here was a Superior Prince defending himself against the unjust attempts, and hostile incursions of his Enemy, who was also inferior to him, as *Eusebius* states it: *whom consult. 10. Book, 8. ch. and 1. Book of Const. life, ch. 42. and 2. Book, ch. 2, &c.*

And for your instance of the *Persians* imploring the aid of the *Romans*, I am afraid it shall serve you in as little stead: for the account *Socrates* gives of it (*lib. 7. cap. 18.*) is, that *Baratanes* King of *Persia*, did severely persecute the Christians, whereupon the Christians that dwelt in *Persia*, were necessitated to fly to the *Romans*, and beseech them not to neglect them who were so destroyed, they were kindly received by *Aticus* the Bishop of *Constantinople*, who bent all his care and thoughts for their aid, and made the matter known to *Theodosius* the second then Emperor: but it happened at that time the *Romans* had a quarrel with the *Persians*, who had hired a great many *Romans* that wrought in Mines, and sent them back without paying the agreed hire; which quarrel was much heightened by the *Persian* Christians complaint; for the King of *Persia* sent Ambassadors to remand them as fugi-

fugitives: but the *Romans* refused to restore them, and not only gave them Sanctuary, but resolved by all their power to defend the Christian Religion, and rather make War with the *Persians*, than see the Christians so destroyed. Now it will be a pretty sleight of *Logick*, if from Subjects flying from a Persecution, and seeking shelter under another Prince, you will infer that they may resist their own King. And for *Theodosius* his War, we see other grounds assigned by the Historian: and the Politicks even of good Princes in their making of Wars, must not be a Rule to our Consciences: neither know I why this instance is adduced, except it be to justify some who are said (during the Wars betwixt their own Sovereign and the Country where they lived) to have openly prayed for Victory against their Country, and to have corresponded in opposition to their native Sovereign.

But I must next discuss that Catalogue of Tumults in the fourth and fifth Century, which are brought as Precedents for the resisting of Subjects: and here I must mind you of the great change was in Christendom after *Constantine's* days, before whom none were Christians, but such as were persuaded of the truth of the Gospel, and were ready to suffer for its profession; so that it being then a Doctrine objected to many Persecutions, few are to be supposed to have

entred into its discipline without some Convictions about it in their Consciences : but the case varied much after the Emperors became Christian ; so that what by the severity of their Laws, what by the authority of their Example, almost all the World rendered themselves Christian ; which did let in such a swarm of corrupt men into the Christian Societies, that the face of them was quickly much changed, and both Clergy and Laity became very corrupt, as appears from the complaints of all the Writers of the fourth Century : what wonder then if a tumultuating Humor crept into such a mixed multitude ? And indeed most of these instances which are alledged, if they be adduced to prove the corruption of that time, they conclude but too well : But, alas ! will they have the authority of Precedents, or can they be look'd upon as the sense of the Church at that time, since they are neither approved by Council or Church-Writer ? And truly the Tumults in these times were too frequent upon various occasions ; but upon none more than the popular elections of Bishops, of which *Nazianzen* gives divers instances, and for which they were taken from the People by the Council of *Laodicea*, *Can. 13.* It is also well enough known how these Tumults flowed more from the tumultuary temper of the People, than from any Doctrine their Teachers did

did infuse in them. And therefore *Socrates lib. 7. cap. 13.* giving account of one of the Tumults of *Alexandria* (made use of by your Friends, as a Precedent) tells how that City was ever inclin'd to Tumults, which were never compesc'd without blood. And at that time differences falling in betwixt *Orestes* the Prefect, and *Cyril* the Bishop, who was the first that turned the Priesthood into a temporal Dominion, they had many debates: for *Orestes* hating the power of the Bishops, which he judg'd detracted from the Prefect's authority, did much oppose *Cyril*; and *Cyril* having rais'd a Tumult against the *Jews*, wherein some of them were killed, and the rest of them driven out of the City, *Orestes* was so displeas'd at that, that he refus'd to be reconcil'd with him; whereupon 500 Monks came down from *Nitria* to fight for their Bishop, who set on the Prefect, and one of them named *Ammonius*, wounded him in the head with a stone; but the People gathering, they all fled, only *Ammonius* was taken, whom the Prefect tortured till he died; but *Cyril* buried him in the Church, and magnified his Fortitude to the degree of reckoning him a Martyr, of which he was afterwards ashamed. And their being in *Alexandria* at that time a learned and famous Lady, call'd *Hyppatia*, whom the People suspected of inflaming the Prefect against the Bishop, they

led on by a Reader of the Church, set on her, and dragged her from her Chariot into a Church, and stript her naked, and most cruelly tore her body to pieces, which they burnt to ashes. And this, saith the Historian, *brought no small Infamy, both on Cyril, and on the Church of Alexandria, since all who profess the Christian Religion, should be strangers to killing, fightings, and such like.* Truly, Sir, he that will found the Doctrine of Resistance on such grounds, hath a mind on very easie terms to run himself upon Condemnation. And yet such like are the warrants your Friends bring from Church History. Therefore I see there is yet good ground to assert that Doctrine was unknown in the Christian Church, till the times wherein the Popes pretended to the Temporal Power over Princes: all whose plea was managed upon the grounds of the great Importance of Religion to be preferred to all human Interests, and that *Christ* had told his Disciples *to buy a sword*; and that Princes being the Ministers of *God*, were to be no longer acknowledged, than they observed that design for which they were set up. Only in one particular, less disorder may be apprehended from the pretensions of the *Roman* Bishops, than from these Maxims that put the power of judging and controuling the Magistrate in the Peoples hands, which opens a door to endless confusions,
and

and indeed sets every private Person on the Throne, and introduceth an Anarchy, which will never admit of order or remedy; whereas these who had but one pretender over them, could more easily deal with him, and more vigorously resist him.

Isot. You have said very many things from History, which I shall not at this time undertake to examine: but I am sure it hath been both the Practice and Doctrine of the Reformed Churches, that in case of unjust Tyranny, the States of a Kingdom may put a stop to the fury of a King: and therefore where the Reformation was opposed by Cruelty, it was also defended by Arms. And let me add, that I believe your great quarrel at this Doctrine, is, because the practice of it was so great a mean of preserving the Reformation, which though, in good manners, you must commend, yet I am afraid you hate it in your heart.

Philar. Whether you or we be greater friends to the Reformation, let the world judge by this one Indication, that you study to draw all can be devised for the staining it with blood, which is the constant calumny of its adversaries, whereas we offer with the clearest evidences to evince its Innocence. But let me premise the distinction of Doctrine from Practices; and tho some unjustifiable Practices appear, these must never

be charged on the Reformed Churches, unless it be made appear they were founded on their Doctrine. Besides, the Reformers coming out of the corruptions of Popery, in which the Doctrine and Practice of Resistance upon pretences of Religion were triumphant, it will not be found strange tho some of that ill-tempered Zeal continued still to leaven them. But for their Doctrine, I take the Standart of it to be in the Confessions of the several Churches; all which being gathered in one harmony, we are in the right scent of their Opinions, when we search for them there. Now the Doctrine of resisting of Magistrates is by divers of their Confessions expressly condemned, but in none of them asserted.

It is true, there were some ambiguous expressions in our *Scots* Confession, registred in Parliament *Anno* 1567, for *Art.* 14. among the transgressions of the second Table, they reckon to *disobey or resist any that God hath placed in authority, while they pass not over the bounds of their office*; which seems to imply the lawfulness of Resistance when they so transgress: but besides that it is not clearly asserted, and only inferred, this doth not determine what the *bounds of the Magistrate's Office* are: And if it be found that his Office is to coërce with the Sword, so as to be accountable to none but to God, then

no Resistance will follow from hence, except of a limited Magistrate who is accountable to others. The same Explication is to be given to that part of the 24. Art. where all such are condemned who *resist the Supream Power, doing that thing which appertaineth to his charge.* But in the same Article the Magistrate is called *God's Lieutenant, in whose Sessions God himself doth sit and judge.* But with this, it is to be considered, when that Confession was ratified in Parliament, even when no Sovereign was to look to the clearing of any ambiguities, which might have been upon design by some, and through the neglect of others, let pass. The Confessions of the other Churches are unexceptionably plain, and without restriction in the point of subjection: For what seems like a Restriction in the *French Confession* (*that the yoke of subjection is willingly to be born, though the Magistrates were Infidels, provided that God's Sovereign authority remain entire and uncorrupted*) imports nothing, but that our subjection to them, which takes in both Obedience and Suffering, is not to strike out the great Dominion God hath over our Souls, whom we should obey rather than man. And even the Confession of the *Assembly of Divines*, ratified by the *Scots General Assembly*, speaks of submission to Authority in absolute terms, without the exception of Resistance

in case of Tyranny, Cap. 22. art. 4. *It is the duty of People — to be subject to their authority for Conscience sake. Infidelity or difference in Religion, doth not make void the Magistrate's just and legal Authority, nor free the people from their due obedience to him.* If then the Doctrine of Resistance be to be owned as a Law of Nature, and as a part of the Christian Freedom, how came it that it was not more expressly owned in this Confession, especially since it is known to have been the opinion of most of both these Assemblies? But on the contrary, it seems condemned, and only the undiscerned reserves of *just, legal, and due*, are slipt in for the defence of their actings. Truly this seems not fair dealing, and such an asserting of Subjection at that time, looks either like the force of truth extorting it, or intimates them afraid, or ashamed to have owned that as their Doctrine to the World. And by this time, I suppose it is clear that the Reformed Churches ought not to be charged with the Doctrine of Resistance.

Poly. Nay, nor the Reformed Writers neither, with whose words I could fill much Paper, and shew how they do all generally condemn the resistance of Subjects: and when any of them gives any Caveat to this, it is not in behalf of the People, but of *the States of the Kingdom, who, they say, perhaps are impowered with authority to curb the tyranny of Kings, as the Ephori among the*

the Lacedemonians, the Tribuns of the people, and the Demarchs in Rome and Athens. Now it is acknowledged, that if by the Laws of the Kingdom it be found that the King is accountable to the States, then their coercing of him is not the resistance of Subjects, but rather the managing of the Supreme Power which lies in their hands. If then you will stand to their decision in this Point, of the Peoples resisting of their Sovereigns, though Tyrants, the debate will not run long, they being so express. And this will be nothing shaken by any thing you may alledge in some corner of a *Peter Martyr*, or some other Persons of less name; for as from the same Writers, other places may be brought to the contrary; so what can these serve to enervate so much evident proof? Besides, we are not to consider the Writings of some particular Persons, so much as what hath been the generally received opinion among the Protestant Writers, and most taught in their Pulpits and Schools. And whoever will attempt the contradicting that this hath been for absolute submission, it must be confessed to be hard to determin, whether his ignorance be most to be pitied, or his confidence most wondered at. By these things all may guess, if there be not strong grounds to apprehend the Reformed Churches must be innocent of that, which both their Confessions disown,

disown. and their Writers condemn.

Isot. I confess the Author of the *Dialogues* did with great confidence undertake the refuting of what is generally acknowledged about resistance used by the Reformed Churches: but his Answerer hath so refuted all he alledgeth from History, that I am confident he repents of his undertaking: and were it to be done again, perhaps he would think on other tasks, than to attempt what hath miscarried so in his hand, that truly I cannot but pity him in my heart.

Eud. It will be strange if he be so much mistaken as your Author represents him, yet his design in that was so good to deliver the Reformation from such a Challenge, that methinks he deserved a little better usage than your Friend bestows on him. But I am much deceived if he be not able to make good all was asserted by him: let us therefore hear what *Polyhistor* saith on these matters.

Isot. Begin then with the matter of the *Albigenses*, where force was used against *Simon Montfort*, who had not only the permission of the *French King*, as is acknowledged, but was assisted by him by 15000. men, which is vouched by some Authors: Besides, that the cruelties then used (which are made use of to aggravate their not resisting the King of *France*) if pertinently adduced, prove the King of *France* guilty

guilty of accession to them. And the Kings Son, Prince *Lewis*, coming with an Army afterward, shews all to have been done by the Kings Command. And what is alledged from the Count of *Toulouse*, his being a Peer of *France*, by which he was a Vassal, and not a Subject, is to no purpose; since by the Feudal Law, Vassals are Subjects; and whatever authority they may have within their own Dominions, they are still Subjects to the Lord of the Feud. See p. 418.

Poly. I shall not with big words blow away what you alledg; but shall examine it from the accounts are given of that War. It is true, the Writers of that time do so strangely misrepresent these Innocents, that little credit is due to most of the Histories about them: but thus much is clear, that the *Waldenses* were every where persecuted, both in *Dauphine*, *Provence*, *Piedmont*, *Calabria*, *Boheme*, and other places, to which they scattered themselves, and fled for shelter: and notwithstanding all the Persecutions they lay under, from the Inquisition in *France*, they never armed against the King's authority. These about *Alby* embracing the same Doctrine with the *Waldenses*, and called from the Country they lived in *Albigenses*, were thundered against by the Pope, and a *Jacobin Monk* being killed in their Country, Pope *Innocent* proclaimed a *Croisade*, promising Paradise to

to all who came and fought against these Hereticks, and avenged the blood of that Monk: and in particular suspecting *Raymond* Count of *Toulouse*, he Excommunicated him, and absolved his Subjects from their obedience, permitting any to pursue his Person, and possess his Lands; with which he wrote to all Christian Princes to come into his *Croisade*. But the King of *France* was imployed in Wars both with the *Emperor* and King of *England*, and so could not join in it, but gave way to his Barons to take the Cross: And here the King consenting to so cruel an Invasion, did undoubtedly shake much of his right to these Provinces, since he thus exposed them to the fury of an unjust Invader; so that tho they had absolutely rejected his Authority, this had quadrated with the case of a Kings deserting of his Subjects. However the War went on, all managed by the *Legate*, as the Popes war. But *Raymond* came and submitted himself to the Pope, yet the *Legate* went on against *Beziers* and *Carcasson*, who had a great deal of reason to resist such an unjust Aggressor. Afterwards the *Legate* gaping for the County of *Toulouse*, picked another quarrel with *Raymond*, and did excommunicate him of new, tho he had got the Popes absolution: whereupon he armed, with the assistance of the King of *Arragon*, against the *Legate*, and his General *Simon Montfort*: but
after-

afterwards the King of *Arragon* was defeated, yet all this while the King of *France* lay neutral, and would not permit his Son to go against the *Albigenses*, because he had promised to the King of *Arragon* to be neutral ; but the King of *Arragon* being dead, he gave way to it, and so his Son came to the Army : and this must be that which *Gulielmus Brito* confounds with the beginning of the War. This also is that Affair which the *Centuriators* say *Philippus Augustus* had with the *Albigenses*. But the *Legate* fearing the numbers Prince *Lewis* brought with him, and apprehending he might have possessed himself of the other places which belonged to the *Albigenses*, granted them all absolution, with the protection of the Church ; and assumed the confidence to tell the Prince, that since he had taken the Cross, he was to depend on his Orders, he representing the Pope, and not to command in that Army as the Kings Son ; reproaching him, because his Father had given no assistance to the destruction of the *Albigenses* when there was need of it : but that after the miraculous Victories had been obtained, he was now come to reap the Harvest of what was due to them who had hazarded their lives for the Church. And for all this, I refer you to the History of the *Albigenses*, compiled by *M. Per-rin lib. 1. cap. 12, &c.* But what if by an overplus

I should justify the Count of *Toulouse*, tho he had armed against the King of *France*, upon the account of his being a Peer of *France*, which exempted him from the condition of ordinary Subjects, of whom *Pasquier Recherches de France, lib. 2. cap. 8* saith, It was the vulgar Opinion, that they were constituted by *Charles the Great*, who is believed to have given them almost as much authority as himself had, reserving only to himself the principal voice in the Chapter: but he refutes that vulgar Error, and shews how in the end of the *Carolo-vingian* Race, great confusions were in *France*, partly through the various Pretenders, but more through their folly: at which time, the Crown of *France* did likewise become Elective: and he shews how *Eude, Robert, Raoul, Lewis*, surnamed *beyond the Sea, Lothair*, and another *Lewis*, were chosen Kings of *France*; and the chief Persons who at that time were most active, were these Dukes, Counts, and Bishops, who afterwards were made Peers. *Hugo Capet* therefore taking possession of the Crown, for securing himself peaceably in it, did confirm those Peers in that great Authority they had assumed; which if he had not done, they had given him more trouble. And their constitution was, that if any difference arose, either betwixt the King, and any of the Peers, or among the Peers themselves, it should be decided by the Council

Council of the whole twelve Peers. And he proves from an old *Placart*, that they would not admit the *Chancellor*, *Connestable*, or any other great Officer of *France* to judg them; they being to be judged by none, but their fellow Peers. These were also to be the *Electors* of the King. But *Hugo Capet* apprehending the danger of a free Election, caused, for preventing it, Crown his Son in his own time, which was practised by four or five succeeding Kings. And *Lewis the Gross* not being crowned in his Fathers time, met with some difficulty at his entry to the Crown; which to guard against, he crowned his Son in his own time, and so that practice continued, till the pretence of electing the King was worn out by prescription. Yet some vestigies of it do still remain, since there must be at all Coronations of *France* twelve to represent the Peers: and by this time, I think it is well enough made out, that the Count of *Toulouse* was not an ordinary Subject. And as for your confounding of Subject and Vassal, *Bodinus lib. de Rep. cap. 9.* will help you to find out a difference betwixt them, who reckons up many kinds of Vassals and Feudataries who are not Subjects: for a Vassal is he that holds Lands of a Superior Lord, upon such conditions as are agreed to by the nature of the Feud, and is bound to protect the Superior, but may quit the Feud, by which he is free of that sub-

subjection: so that the dependence of Vassals on their Lord, must be determined by the Contract betwixt them, and not by the ordinary Laws of Subjects. And from this he concludes, that one may be a Subject and no Vassal, a Vassal and no Subject, and likewise both Vassal and Subject. The Peers of *France* did indeed give an Oath of homage, by which they became the Liege-men of the King, but were not for that his Subjects: for the Oath the Subjects swore, was of a far greater extent. And thus I am deceived if all was asserted by the *Conformist* in the *Dialogues* on this head, be not made good.

Isot. But since you examine this instance so accurately, what say you to those of *Piedmont*, who made a League among themselves against their Prince, and did resist his cruel Persecutions by Armies. See pag. 423.

Poly. Truly, I can say little on this Subject, having seen none of their Writings or Apologies, so that I know not on what grounds they went: and I see so much ignorance and partiality in accounts given from the second hand, that I seldom consider them much.

Isot. The next instance in History, is, from the Wars of *Boheme*, where because the Chalice was denied, the People did by violence resist their King, and were headed by *Zisca*, who gained many Victories in the following War
with

with *Sigismund*; and in the same Kingdom fifty years ago, they not only resisted first *Matthias*, and then *Ferdinand* their King, but rejected his authority, and choosed a new King: and the account of this change, was, because he would not make good what *Maximilian* and *Rodolph* did grant about the free exercise of their Religion: and thus when engagements were broken to them, they did not judge themselves bound to that tame submission you plead for. See p. 424.

Poly. Remember what was laid down as a ground, that the Laws of a Society must determine who is invested with the Sovereign Power, which doth not always follow the Title of a King: but if he be accountable to any other Court, he is but a Subject, and the Sovereign Power rests in that Court. If then it be made out that the States of *Bohemia* are the Sovereigns, and that the Kings are accountable to them, this instance will not advance the plea of defensive Arms by Subjects. That the Crown of *Bohemia* is elective, was indeed much contraverted; and was at length, and not without great likelihoods on both sides, of late debated in divers Writings: but among all that were impartial, they prevailed who pleaded its being elective. Yet I acknowledge this alone will not prove it free for the People to resist, unless it be also apparent that the Supreme Power remained with the

States, which as it is almost always found to dwell with the People, when the King is elected by them. *Bodin* doth reckon the King of *Bohemia* among these that are but Titular Kings: and the Provincial Constitutions of that Kingdom do evidently demonstrate, that the King is only the Administrator, but not the fountain of their Power: which is made out from many instances, by him who writes the *Republick of Bohemia*, who shews how these Kings are bound to follow the pleasure and Counsel of their States: and in the year 1135, it was decreed, that the elected Prince of *Bohemia* should bind himself by his Coronation Oath to rules there set down; which if he broke, the States were to pay him no Tributes, nor to be tied to any further Obedience to him, till he amended. See *Hagecius ad ann.* 1135. And this Oath was taken by all the following Dukes and Kings of *Bohemia*; which is an evident proof that the States had authority over their Kings, and might judge them. To this also might be added divers instances of their deposing their Kings, upon which no censure ever passed. These being then the grounds on which the *Bohemians* walked, it is clear they never justified their Resistance, on the account of Subjects fighting for Religion, but on the liberties of a free State, asserting their Religion when invaded by a limited Prince.

The

The account of the first *Bohemian* War, is, that *John Huss* and *Ferome of Prague*, being notwithstanding the Emperors Safe-conduct burnt at *Constance*, the whole States of *Bohemia* and *Moravia* met at *Prague*, and found that by the burning of their Doctors, an injury was done to the whole Kingdom, which was thereby marked with the stain of Heresie: and they first expostulated with the Emperor and Counsel about the wrong done them; but no reparation being made, they resolved to seek it by force, and to defend the Religion had been preached by *Huss*; and did declare their design to *Winceslaus* their King (whom the States had before that time made prisoner twice for his maleversation) but at that very time he died in an Apoplexy, some say through grief at that. After his death, *Sigismund* his Brother pretended to the Crown of *Bohemia*: but not being elected, was not their righteous King: so in the following Wars that were betwixt him and *Zisca*, the resistance was not made to the King of *Bohemia*, and therefore all that time was an *Interregnum*, and is so marked by their Historian, who tells, that the *Bohemians* could not be induced to receive him to be their King: he indeed invaded the Kingdom, and crowned himself, but was not chosen by the States till fifteen years after that a Peace was concluded, and he with great difficulty prevailed

upon the States to ratifie his Coronation, and acknowledge him their King. *See Dub. lib. 24. & lib. 26.* And by all this, I doubt not but you are convinced that the Wars of *Zisca* were not of the nature of Subjects resisting their Sovereign. And for the late *Bohemian* War, besides what was already alledged of the Power of the States, their War against *Ferdinand*, and the reason why by a solemn decree they rejected him, was, because he invaded the Crown without an Election, contrary to the fundamental Laws of the Kingdom: hereupon they choosed the *Prince Elector Palatine* to be their King. It is true, they rose also in Arms while *Matthias* lived, though he did not long survive these Tumults: but in all their Apologies they founded their plea on the Liberties of the Kingdom of *Bohemia*. And yet though this say much for their defence, I am none of the Patrons of that War, which had very few defenders among the Protestants.

Isot. At length you must yield there was War for defence of Religion: but if without the inclosure of *Bohemia* we examine the History of *Germany*, there we meet with that famous *Smalcaldick* War, in opposition to *Charles V.* who was designing the overthrow of the Protestant Doctrine, which the *Elect*or of *Saxony*, with the *Landgrave* of *Hessen*, and other free Cities, managed against him. *See p. 427.*

Poly.

Poly. If any of the Passions of men have mingled in the actions of Protestants, must these therefore be fasten'd on them as their Doctrine; especially when they went not upon Principles of Religion, but of Provincial Laws? As for *Germany*, let me first tell you how far the Protestants were against Rebellion, upon pretence of Religion. At first the *Rustick War* had almost kindled all *Germany*, which indeed began upon very unjust Causes; but *Sleydan lib. 5.* tells, That *some troublesome Preachers had been the causers of that great and formidable War.* Now it is to little purpose to say they were in many errors, and so fought not for the true Religion; since it was before made out, that if Religion be to be fought for, every man believing his own Religion to be true, is bound to take Arms in its defence, since even an erring Conscience binds: But as these Tumults did spread through *Germany*, *Luther* published a Writing, desiring all to abstain from Sedition, though withal he told he apprehended *some strange Judgment was hanging over the Church-men: but that was to be left to God.* After which he explains the duty of the Magistrates: And adds, That *the People should be severely charged not to stir without the command of their Magistrates, and that nothing was to be attempted by private Persons: that all Sedition was against the command of God, and that Sedition was*

nothing but private Revenge, and therefore hated by God. Adding, *That the Seditions then stirring, were raised by the Devil, who stirred up these who professed the Gospel to them, that thereby the truth might be brought under hatred and reproach, as if that could not be of God which gave occasion to so great evils.* Then he tells what means were to be used for advancing of the Gospel, *That they were to repent of their sins, for which God had permitted that tyranny of the Church-men.* Next, *That they should pray for the Divine aid, and publicly assert the truth of the Gospel, and discover the Impostures of the Popes.* And he adds, *That this had been his method, which had been much blessed of God.* In a word, the whole strain of that first Paper shews, that the great bait used to train all into that Rebellion, was the pretence of the liberty of Religion, and the tyrannical oppression they were kept under by the Ecclesiasticks.

But upon this the *Boures* published a Writing containing their Grievances: The first whereof was, *That they might have liberty to choose Ministers, who might preach the Word of God purely to them, without the mixture of mens devises.* The other particulars related to their Civil Liberties. And upon these Pretensions they appealed to *Luther*, who wrote again, *Acknowledging the great Guilt of these Princes who received not the purity of the Gospel; but he warns the People*

to consider what they did, lest they lost both Body and Soul in what they attempted. That they were neither to consider their own strength, nor the faultiness of their Adversaries, but the justice and lawfulness of the Cause; and to be careful not to believe all Mens preachings; for the Devil had raised up many Seditions and bloody Teachers at that time. Wherefore he forbids them to take God's Name in vain, and pretend that they desired in all things to follow his Laws: But minds them who threatned, that they who took the Sword, should perish by the Sword: and of the Apostle, who commands all to be obedient to Magistrates, charging on them, that though they pretended the Laws of God, yet they took the Sword, and resisted the Magistrate. But he adds, You say, the Magistrates become intolerable, for they take the Doctrine of the Gospel from us, and oppress us to the highest degree: But be it so, stirrings and seditions are not therefore to be raised, neither must every one coërce crimes, that belongs to him to whom the power of the Sword is given, as is express in Scripture. And besides, this is not only according to the Laws, but is by the light of Nature impressed on all mens minds: which shews, that no man can cognosce and judge in his own Cause, since all men are blinded with self-love: And it cannot be denied, but this Tumult and Sedition of yours, is a private Revenge: But if you have any warrant for this from God, you must make it out by some signal Miracle. The

Magistrate indeed doth unjustly, but you much more so, who contemning the Command of God, invade anothers Jurisdiction. And he tells them, That if these things take place, there will be no more Magistracy, nor Courts of Justice, if every man exercise private Revenge. And if this be unlawful in a private Person, much more is it so in a multitude gathered together. Wherefore he counts them unworthy of the name of Christians, nay worse than Turks, who thus violate the Laws of Nature. Then for proof of his opinion, he adduceth that of our Lord's, resist not evil; as also his reproving of S. Peter for smiting with the Sword. These steps were to be followed by you, saith he, or this glorious Title must be laid down. And if you followed his Example, God's power would appear, and he would undoubtedly have regard to you. And he adds, How far he had been always from such Practices, and how God had blessed his work in his hands: but for you, you advert not how much you obstruct that which you think to promote. These are a few of Luther's words, by which it will appear both upon what pretences these Bourses went, and what his sense of them was. But I know it will be said, that as in the first ages of the Church, these good simple men understood not their Liberties nor Privileges, but were wheedled into a sheepish tameness: so likewise when the Reformation was first springing, they did not in that infancy under-

understand the heroick doctrine, that the following ripeness of some Martial Spirits did broach and maintain. Alas! *Luther*, poor Man! he had been bred in his Monastery, and understood not the brave Achievements of Christian Chivalry.

But who would bear with such disingenuity, as to say, that because he defines Sedition to be private revenge, and afterwards condemns private revenge, therefore he must be understood as only condemning that? *pag. 432.* But as none that reads *Sleydan* dare say that I have alledged one word in *Luther's* name, but what is faithfully translated out of these Writings: so the parcels I have here inserted, will clearly discover that Rebellion to have been coloured over with the pretence of Oppression, Persecution, and hindering the Doctrine of the Gospel: and *Luther's* opinion in that must not be looked upon, as only his private sense, but that which was undoubtedly received by the rest of the Protestants in *Germany*, as appears by the series of the Story. And whatever passion *Luther* might have expressed, that will no more brangle what I say, than any of his other unjustifiable fervors will shake the rest of his Doctrine. For I do not adduce him here only as a private Doctor speaking his single thoughts, but as the Head of the Protestants, delivering a Doctrine which

which was then received among them.

Isot. But he afterwards changed his Opinion when the League of *Smalcald* was entred into, and then we find the Protestants in another tune; for upon apprehensions of mischief designed against them, they entred into a defensive League among themselves: tho the Constitution of the Empire being feudal, the Emperor was their Sovereign: yet both Princes and free Cities entred into this League, which afterwards broke out into War. See p. 433.

Poly. Before I examine that Affair, I must first clear the way by removing a mistake, which truly I judged none capable of that had ever read any thing of the Constitution of the *German Empire*, or of the Power of the *Electors, Princes, and free Cities*. I must therefore since I have to do with so much ignorance or perverseness, shew that the Emperor is not Sovereign in *Germany*; though the thing is so plain, that I am almost ashamed to go about it. The *German Empire* was hereditary from the days of *Charles the Great* till *Henry the Fowler*, and then it begun to be Elective: and as is usual in all such cases, they who had the right of Election, got by degrees the authority transferred upon themselves: but the particular time when this begun, is not so clearly defined by the *German Writers*. It is true, the *Diet of Germany* is not like the League of the

the *United Provinces*, or of the *Cantons* of *Switzerland*, where the Authority remains with the several States and *Cantons*, and they only meet for Counsel: but the *Diet* hath the supreme Authority, both of deposing of Emperors, as was practised in the case of *Adolphus* and *Wenceslaus*, and of fining, banishing, and forfeiting, either Princes or Cities. And the Princes declare after the Emperor is Crowned, that they are the Vassals of the Empire, and not of the Emperor. And when the *Diet* sits not, all things are judged by the *Imperial Chamber*, whose President must be a Prince of the Empire, who hath six Assessors from the Emperor, seven from the seven *Electors*, twenty from the ten Circles, two from each of them; and by them all the differences among the Princes or Members of the Empire are decided. Upon greater occasions, the *Diet* is called, which *Thuan* compares to the Assembly of the *Amphietyons* in *Greece*, that was made up of Princes, who had no dependence one upon another. The *Diet* is not called by the Emperor, but by the Decree of a former *Diet*: or if the Emperor call one, the Princes are not bound to come to it. And so the Princes refused to come *Anno* 1554. and *An.* 1566. By the *Diet* Laws are given to the Emperour, as well as to the other Princes: and any Money is raised for the use of the Empire, is not put in the

the Emperors hands, but in the bank of some Town, as shall be agreed on. *Bodin* tells he saw Letters from a *German Prince* to *Monmorancy*, telling him, that the King of *France* had reason to complain of *Charles* the Fifth, and of his Brother, to the Duke of *Saxony*, and the Count *Palatine*, who were the Vicars of the Empire, because they had, contrary to the Laws of the Empire, and former Customs, suppressed the Kings Letters to the States of the Empire. And *Maximilian* the first in a Diet at *Constance*, Anno 1507. acknowledged, that the Majesty of the *German Empire* consisted in the Princes, and not in the Emperor himself. I might here add much from the way of the Emperors treating with the Princes, by sending and receiving of Ambassadors that go betwixt them, by the state in which he receives Visits from them, and returns them to them, by the Princes treating and being treated with, by all forein Princes, who write to them *Brother*, and not *Cousin*, by their making of Peace and War among themselves: and should indeed run out into a long digression, if I adduced all might be alledged for proving the Princes of the Empire to be none of the Emperors Subjects: but I have no mind to engage in a vain shew of reading upon so plain a Subject. One thing I shall only add, that by the 12. Chapter of the *Bulla Aurea*, it is expressly provided,

that

that the Electors shall meet together yearly in the four weeks that follow *Easter*, for consulting about the Affairs of the Empire: and this is thus explained in the 4th Article of the *Cesarean Capitulation*, *That it shall be free for the six Electors by the vigor of the Bulla Aurea, to meet together as often as they please, for consulting about the Commonwealth, and that the Emperour shall make no hinderance to it, nor take it in ill part.* And hence it is that these who give account of the state of the Empire, laugh at their ignorance, who through a childish mistake ascribe the Sovereign Power to the Emperor. The same may be added of the free Cities united together by a League at least 500 years old, called the *Hanse-towns*, who came under the protection of the Master of the *Teutonic Order*, that possessed *Prusse*: and *an. 1206.* they were so free, that they sent a Navy to *Henry III. of England*, and got great priviledges from him for their traffick in *England*. There were then 72. Cities in the League, who renewed their League every tenth year, and consulted whom to receive, or whom to exclude from their friendship, and choosed a Protector to themselves. And one of the Conditions on which any City might be of this League, was, that they were free Towns: and therefore it was that some Towns in the *Netherlands* being of this League, their

their Princes were by Oath to confirm their freedom, otherwise they could not be comprehended within that League; the end whereof was to defend one another in any necessity they might fall in. Let these things then declare whether *Germany* be a Monarchy or not, and it will never prove the Emperor to be the Sovereign, because the Empire is feudal, and the Emperor gives the Investitures to the Princes; for they are not the Feudatories of the Emperor, but of the Empire: and the Emperor by giving the Investiture becomes not their Lord: for in the Interregn of the Empire, the *Electors of Palatine* and *Saxe* are the Vicars of the Empire, and give the Investitures, who are not clothed with any authority over the rest, but only as they are the Vicars of the Empire, and not of the Emperor. And most of the Princes of *Italy* receive still their Investiture from the Emperor, but are far from concluding themselves his Subjects upon that account. And who thinks the King of *Naples* the Popes Subject, tho he receive his Investiture in that Crown from him? These things being thus cleared, it will be evident that the Wars betwixt *Charles V.* and the Duke of *Saxony*, will never be a Precedent for Subjects resisting their Sovereign. And having said so much, it will be to no purpose to examine the rise and progress of the *Smalcaldic League*,

League and War, only thus much is clear, that the leaguings of the Princes and Cities together among themselves, or with other Princes, was not held contrary to the Laws of the Empire: for after the *Smalcaldic* League, both the Emperor and other Kings, as *France* and *England*, treated with them, and sent Embassadors to them: Yea, the Pope sent a *Nuncio* to the *Elector* of *Saxe*, and *Landgrave* of *Hessen* at *Smalcald*, and yet never were they accused by the Emperor for entering into that League of mutual defence: which shews it was not judged contrary to the duty of these Princes to associate among themselves, or with others. And the City of *Strasburg*, and after them the *Landgrave* of *Hessen*, made a League with the *Switzer Cantons* that received the Reformation, for mutual defence against any Invasion upon the account of Religion. At *Ausburg* the Emperor did on the 11. of *November* 1530. declare, that since the Protestants did reject the Decree made about Religion, he had entred in an agreement with the rest of the *Diet*, not to offend any, but to defend themselves, if any force were used against these who owned that Religion. And in the following *December* the Protestant Princes met at *Smalcald*, and made an agreement among themselves in the same strain: neither were they ever condemned for so doing, but continued in a good

cor-

correspondence with the Emperor many years after that, till being invaded by the Duke of *Brunswick* the War took its rise, which is all along proved to have been according to the Laws and Liberties of the Empire. And thus this Case doth vary exceedingly from the matter of our Debates.

Eud. If I may glean after your Harvest, I could add, that the Divines of *Germany* were notwithstanding of all the immunity of the Princes, and injuries they met with, very much against all warlike preparations. Many vestiges of this appear through *Melancton's* Letters, particularly in his 71. Letter to *Camerarius* an. 1528. where he gives account of the inclinations many had to War, and with how much diligence he had studied to divert them from it, though great injuries had been done them; and that it was believed that many of the Princes had signed a conspiracy against them. And *Sculdet Exer. Evang. lib. 2. cap. 5.* tells how *Grumbachius* and *Justus Jonas* animated the Elector of *Saxe* to the War, assuring him of the Empire of *Germany*, if he would adventure for it: which, he adds, the Elector did: and his so doing, he compares to his throwing himself over the Pinnacle of the Temple; but all quickly repented them of the attempt, the Elector being defeated, taken, and kept Prisoner many years,

years, and his ill Counsellors were well served for their advice, *Grumbachius* was quartered, and *Jonas* was beheaded. Thus you see how that war is censured by one of the best of the late *German* Divines. By this time, I think no scruples can dwell with any about the *German* War, and that it agrees with the case of a Prince defending his Religion and Subjects, against the unjust invasion of another Prince, to whom he owes neither obedience nor subjection: and this will easily satisfy all that know either Law or History, whether the Author of the *Dialogues* deserved to be treated as his *Answerer* doth: But it is no new thing to find ignorants full of confidence, and cowards full of boastings.

Isot. But for *Sweden*, you yield it, and acknowledge, that because their King came against them in an unjust invasion, designing to subvert their Religion, they not only armed against him, and resisted him, but deposed him, and put his Uncle in his place, than which nothing can be more express. See p. 441.

Poly. The design of the *Conformist* was to prove that the first Reformers did not teach the doctrine of Subjects their resistance upon the account of Religion; but he meant not to make good all that followed after that: therefore left the more inconsiderate when they heard of the States of *Sweden* their deposing of *Sigismund*,

H

might

might have mistaken that, as he knows some have done, and confounded it with the Reformation, he gave the true account of that Affair as it was: and it being seventy years after the Reformation was first brought thither, cannot be fastened on the Reformation. Besides the whole Tract of the *Swedish* History proves, that the Estates, as they elected, so also coerced, and frequently deposed their Kings: and therefore *Bodin* reckons *Sweden* among these divided States, where the Supreme Power lay betwixt the King and the Nobility: and tells how in his own time *Henry* King of *Sweden* having killed with his own hand, one that presented a petition to him, the States forced him to quit the Kingdom to his Brother: and that he had been for seventeen years a prisoner when he wrote his Books *de Republica*: It being thus frequent in *Sweden* upon malversation, not only to resist, but to depose their Kings, it was no wonder if when *Sigismund* came against them with an army of *Polanders*, whose Sovereign he was not, (for none are so ignorant to think the King of *Poland* is a Sovereign) they resisted him: since that was a subjecting of *Sweden* to foreign force, and so did totally overturn the whole Foundation of the Kingdom. But after all this, I may add, that *Charles* Duke of *Suderman*, was not too well reported of, for that abrogation of his
Nephew

Nephew, it being generally imputed to his ambition. And thus you see upon how many Accounts that Action of the *Swedish* State will not serve your turn.

Isot. But these of *Zurich* resisted the other five Cantons, and being provoked by their injuries, they stop'd the Passages of Victuals to them, upon which a War followed. As also at *Basel*, the people did maintain and assert the Reformation by Arms against their Superiors, and brake the Images, and burnt them: they also made the Senate turn off some of their number who favored the *Mals*. See p. 443, 444.

Poly. As for the War among the *Cantons*, it is undeniable that it was not of Subjects against their Sovereigns, since the Cities of *Helvetia* have no dependence one upon another; nor can any one City be tied to the opinion or decree of the rest, without their own consent: which shews that every *Canton* is a free State within it self, and therefore their warrings among themselves, makes nothing for subjects resisting of their Sovereigns. And what is alledged from the tumult of *Basel*, is as little to our purpose: for these free Cities being Democratical, it was no wonder if the people offended with the Senate, did raise that Commotion: and the Historian expressly asserts, that what they did, they openly declared, was not for defence of Religion,

but for vindicating of their own liberty. And in the end of the Story it appears what they designed, for they made the Senat receive 260. out of the Companies of the Citizens, whose counsel should be carried along in the greater concernments, that might be either for G O D's Glory, or the Good of the Commonwealth. But if you lay claim to this Story as a Precedent, you must acknowledge that a Reformation may be not only maintained by force, but that Magistrats may be removed from their Office, if they go not along with it; and that the people may in their own Authority, without waiting for the Magistrats concurrence, go by violence and break down Images, and throw out an established Religion. But this belongs not to the case of Subjects, since in these free Cities the power is certainly with the people, and so they are not Subjects to the Senat. And for *Geneve*, it is so fully proved, that it was a free Imperial City, that I need add nothing to make it out. One instance will abundantly suffice to prevail upon the belief of any who can doubt whether the Bishop of *Geneve* was their Prince, which is, that the Bishops of *Geneve* did frequently become Burgessees in it: In particular, *Peter de Baulm*, the last who sate there, was received a Citizen by the Senat of *Geneve* 15. July 1527. which doth fully prove that he could not be their

their Lord. But as for the Reformation of *Geneve*, it is true *Sleydan* hints as if the Bishop and Clergy had left the City, being angry at the Reformation: but in that he was mistaken, for their Bishop left the City *an.* 1528. and made war against it upon some disputes were betwixt him and them about their privileges: for though he was not Lord of the City, yet the Countrey about it belonged to him. But *an.* 1533. he returned to the City, and left it in the *July* of the same year, fearing some seditious Tumults, which he had the more reason to apprehend, because of his Transactions with the Duke of *Savoy*, whereby he made over to him his interest in the City. And it was two years after this before the Reformation was received by that City. For after he left them, they passed a Decree for preserving the old Religion, and discharging of the *Lutheran*, and banished two of the Ministers of that Religion. And on the first of *January* 1534. after the Bishop was gone, his Vicar published an Edict, discharging all Assemblies for Divine Worship, without the Bishops permission; and all Bibles in the *French* or *German* Tongues, were condemned to be burnt. And for the Duke of *Savoy* his invading them, and being resisted by them, it makes nothing for your design, this being a free Imperial City, resisting an unjust Invader. For all this, see *Geneva restituta.*

Isot. But at least the States of the United Provinces did maintain their Religion by Arms, when *Philip* the Second was introducing the Inquisition among them: and tho these Wars were upon mixed grounds, so that Papists as well as Protestants concurred in them, yet it is undeniable that Religion gave the chief rise to them, and was the main consideration that engaged the Protestants into that War. See pag. 446.

Poly. One error runs through all your smatterings, which is, that you never distinguish betwixt a State governed by a Monarch, where subjection is due to him by the constitution of the State, and a limited Prince, who by the Laws of that Society is accountable to, and censurable by the Nobility and people; which states so great a difference, that he must be very purblind who doth not observe it; And therefore I will first shew you, that the Prince of the *Netherlands* was but a precarious Prince, governing a free people at their pleasure and precariously, as *Heuterus* and *Grotius de Ant. Reip. Batav.* call him: And among the Laws of the Government of *Batavia*, one was, that the old Customs and Laws should be sacred; and that if the Prince decreed ought against them, he was not to be obeyed: and so it was usual among them upon a transgression, to depose their Princes, of which many

many instances are reckoned by *Grotius*, and therefore he compares their Princes to the *Lacedemonian* Kings, upon whom the *Ephori* and the Senat might have cognosced. The *Brabantins* had indeed looked better to their liberty than the rest, and so had guarded against the deceit of their Princes (who might have broken their Laws upon the pretence of a publick good) by an expresse agreement, that if their Prince should violate the Laws, they should not be tied to obedience nor fidelity to him, till their injuries were removed: and this was confirmed by the examples of their Ancestors, *Gr. An. lib. 2.* And a little after, he adds, That the other Provinces in *Belgium*, had by practice that same privilege, and that the rather, that being all united to *Brabant*, by *Maximilian*, they were to enjoy the same privileges with them. The *Brabantins* had also a privilege of chusing a Conservator in any great hazard, called *Ruart*, *Strada tom. 1. lib. 9.* whose power was equal to the *Roman* Dictators: this they had by the privileges of the *Lætus introitus*: And upon this they chused the Prince of *Orange* their *Ruart*, anno 1577. And to run no further for proofs of this, when *Philip* was inaugurated their Prince, he expressly provided, that if he broke their privileges, they should be free from obedience and fidelity to him: and this was the

ground on which they deposed him, as appears by their Decree, *St. tom. 2. lib. 4.* By these indications it is apparent, that the Prince of the *Netherlands* was not Sovereign of these Provinces, since they could cognosce upon him, and shake off his authority. But I shall next make out, that *Religion* was not the ground upon which these Wars were raised: The Reformation came unto the Provinces in *Charles the V.* his time, who cruelly persecuted all who received it, so that these who were butchered in his time, are reckoned not to be under 100000. *Gr. Annal. lib. 1.* All this Cruelty did neither provoke them to Arms, nor quench the Spirit of Reformation; whereupon *Philip* designed to introduce the Inquisition among them, as an assured mean of extinguishing that Light. But that Court was every where so odious, and proceeded so illegally, that many of the Nobility, among whom divers were Papists, entered in a Confederacy against it, promising to defend one another, if endangered: Upon this, there were first petitions, and after that tumults; but it went no further till the Duke of *Alva* came, and proceeded at the rate of the highest Tyranny imaginable, both against their Lives and Fortunes, particularly against the Counts of *Egmont* and *Horn*, suspect of favoring the former disorders. But (it being needless to make a vain
shew

shew of reading in a thing which every boy may know) after the Duke of *Alva* had so transgressed all Limits, the Nobility and Deputies of the Towns of *Holland*, who were the Depositories of the Laws and Privileges of that State, met at *Dort*, anno 1572. *Gr. de Ant. Bat. cap. 6.* and on *July 19*, decreed a War against the Duke of *Alva*, and made the Prince of *Orange* their Captain, which was done upon his exacting the twentieth penny of their Rents, and the tenth of their moveables, in all their transactions and merchandises. Yet all this while the power was in the hands of Papists, *Gr. Annal. lib. 3.* Nor was the Protestant Religion permitted till the year 1578. that in *Amsterdam*, *Utrecht* and *Harlem*, the Magistrats who were addicted to the *Roman* Religion, were turned out, which gave great offence to some of their Confederates who adhered to Popery. And upon this the Protestants petitioned the Arch-Duke *Matthias*, whom the States had chosen for their Prince, that since it was known that they were the chief object of the *Spanish* hatred, and so might look for the hardest measure, if they prevailed: it was therefore just they who were in the chief danger, might now enjoy some share of the Liberty with the rest; wherefore they desired they might have Churches allowed them, and might not be barred from publick trust,

trust, which after some debate was granted. And let this declare whether the War was managed upon the grounds of Religion. or not. The year after this, the States of *Holland*, *Geldres*, *Zeland*, *Utrecht*, and *Friesland*, met at *Utrecht*, and entred in that Union which continues to this day: by which it was provided, that the Reformed Religion should be received in *Holland* and *Zeland*, but the rest were at liberty, either to chuse it or another, or both, as they pleased. So we see they did not confederate against *Spain* upon the account of Religion, it not being the ground of their League; but in opposition to the *Spanish* Tyranny and Pride. And in their Letters to the Emperor, *Jan. 8*, 1578. *Str. tom. 2. lib. 2.* they declared, that they never were, nor ever should be of another mind, but that the Catholick Religion should be still observed in *Holland*: and in the end of the year 1581. they decreed, that *Philip* had forfeited his Title to the Principality of *Belgium*, by his violating their Privileges, which he had sworn to observe: whereupon they were (according to their compact with him at his inauguration) free from their obedience to him; and therefore they chused the Duke of *Alençon* to be their Prince: And now review all this, and see if you can stand to your former assertion, or believe these Wars to have proceeded upon

upon the grounds of subjects resisting their Sovereign, when he persecutes them upon the account of Religion, and you will be made to acknowledge, that the States of *Holland* were not subjects, and that their quarrel was not Religion.

Ifot. All this will perhaps be answered in due time: but from this let me lead you to *France*, where we find a long Tract of Civil Wars upon the account of Religion, and here you cannot pretend the King is a limited Sovereign; neither was this War managed by the whole States of *France*, but by the Princes of the Blood, with the Nobility of some of the Provinces; and these began under *Francis* the Second, then about sixteen years of Age, so that he was not under Non-age: and tho they were prosecuted under the Minority of *Charles* the Ninth, yet the King of *Navarre*, who was Regent, and so bore the King's Authority, was resisted: and after *Charles* was of age, the Wars continued, both during his Reign, and much of his Brother's, and did again break out in the last King's Reign. The Protestants were also owned and assisted in these Wars, not only by the Princes of *Germany*, but by the three last Princes who reigned in *Britain*. So here we have an undeniable instance of Subjects defending Religion by Arms. See pag. 454.

Poly.

Poly. I must again put my self and the company to a new penance by this ill understood piece of History, which you have alledged and tell you how upon *Henry* the Second's death *Francis* his Son, was under age by the *French* Law, (for which see *Thuan. lib. 16.*) which appointed the Regents power to continue till the King was 22 years of age at least, as had been done in the case of *Charles* the 6. which yet the History of that time saith, was a rare privilege, granted him because of his Gracefulness, and the love was generally born him, whereas the year wherein the Kings were judged capable of the Government was 25. But *Francis*, tho under age, being every way a Child, did set away both the Princes of the Blood, the Constable and the Admiral from the Government, which he committed to his Mother, the Cardinal of *Lorraine* and the Duke of *Guise*. Upon this the Princes of the Blood met, and sent the King of *Navarre* who was the first Prince of the Blood, to the King, to complain of their ill usage: but tho he was much neglected at Court, yet his simplicity was such, that he was easily whedled out of his pretensions. Upon this the Prince of *Condé* having a greater spirit, and being poor, thought upon other Courses, and as it is related by *Davila, lib. 1.* gathered a meeting at *Ferté*, where he proposed the injury done

one the Princes of the Blood, who in the minority of their King were now excluded the Government: which, contrary to the *Salick* law, was put in a womans hand, and trusted to Strangers: wherefore he moved that (according to the practices of other Princes of the Blood, in the like Cases, which he adduced) they might by arms make good their right, and assume the Government in the Kings minority. But the Admiral considering well the hardiness of the enterprize, said, that another way must be taken to make it succeed, which was, that since *France* was full of the followers of *Calvin*, who through the persecutions they had lain under, were now almost desperat, and had a particular hatred at the Brethren of *Lorrain* as their chief enemies, therefore it was fit to cherish them, and make a party of them, by which means assistance might be likewise hoped for from the Princes of *Germany*, and the Queen of *England*: and to this advice all present did yield. Upon this, saith *Thuan*, lib. 16. many Writings were published, proving the Government of the Kingdom in the King's minority to belong to the Princes of the Blood, and that by the Laws of *France*, the Regents power was not absolute, but to be regulated by the Assembly of the States, wherein many instances of the *French* Law were adduced: and whereas it was alledged that the King was major at 15. which

which was proved from an Edict of *Charles* the Fifth, this was fully refuted; and it was shewed that notwithstanding of the Edict of *Charles* the Fifth, his Son was not admitted to the Government till he was full 22 years of age, and that in his minority the Kingdom was governed by a Council of the Princes and Nobility, which was established by an Assembly of the States. I shall not meddle further in the debate which was on both hands about the year of the King's majority, or the Power of the Princes of the Blood in his minority, but shall refer the Reader to the sixth Book of the voluminous History of *France*, for that time, whose Author hath suppressed his Name, where a full abstract of all the writings that passed on both sides about these matters is set down: but this shews how little your Friends understand the History of that time, who take it for granted that *Francis* the Second was then Major, since it was the great matter in controversy. But to proceed in my Accounts.

These grounds being laid down for a war, the Prince of *Condé*, as *Thuan* relates, would not openly own an accession to any design, till it should be in a good forwardness, but trusted the management of it to one *Renaudy*, who tho' a Catholick by his Religion, yet drew a great meeting of Protestants to *Nantes*, in the beginning of *February*, anno 1560. where he stirred them

hem up to arm : and in his Speech, after he had represented all the grievances, he added, that the greatest scruples that stuck with many, was the King's Authority, against which whoſo roſe he did rebel : and he answered, acknowledging the obedience due to Kings, notwithstanding their wicked Laws ; and that it was without doubt, that all who reſiſted the Power conſtituted by G O D, reſiſted his Ordinance : but added, their reſiſtance was of theſe Traitors, who having poſſeſſed themſelves of the young King, deſigned the ruin both of King and Kingdom. This then will clear whether they walked on the Principles of Subjects reſiſting when perſecuted by their Sovereign, or not.

Upon this they deſigned to have ſeiſed on the King, but as it was to be executed, though it had been long carried with a marvellous ſecrecy, it was at length diſcovered, and the King conveyed to *Amboiſe* : and as the Proteſtants were gathering to a Head, the King's Forces came upon them, and defeated and ſcattered them. But a little after this the King died, in good time for the Prince of *Condé* ; for his acceſſion to theſe Commotions being diſcovered, he was ſeiſed on and ſentenced to death ; but the King's death as it delivered him, did alſo put an end to the queſtions about the King's majority, his Brother *Charles* the Ninth, being a child,

child, so that the Regency was undoubtedly the King of *Navarre* his right; yet not so entirely but that the other Princes were to share with him, and the Assembly of the States to direct him, as the Lawyers proved from the *French* Law. The consultation about the Protestants took them long up, and a severe Edict passed against them in *July* 1561. But in the *January* of the next year a solemn meeting was called of all the Princes of the Blood, the Privy Counsellors and the eighth Parliament of *France*, in which the Edict of *January* was passed; giving the Protestants the free exercise of their Religion, and all the Magistrats of *France* were commanded to punish any who interrupted or hindered this liberty, which Edict you may see at length, *Hist. d' Aubig. lib. 2. c. 32*. But after this, as *Davila, lib. 3*, relates how the Duke of *Guise* coming to *Paris* did disturb a meeting of the Protestants, so that it went to the throwing of Stones, with one of which the Duke was hurt, upon which he designed the breach of that Edict, and so was the Author and Contriver of the following Wars. After this the Edict was every where violated, and the King of *Navarre* united with the Constable, and the Duke of *Guise* for the ruin of the Protestants: upon which the Prince of *Condé*, as the next Prince of the Blood, asserted the Edicts, so that the Law was on his side: neither

ther was the Regents power absolute or Sovereign : and the Prince of *Condé* in his *Manifesto* declared, he had armed to free the King from that captivity these stranger Princes kept him in, and that his design was only to assert the authority of the late Edict, which others were violating. Upon this the Wars began, and ere the year was ended, the King of *Navarre* was killed : after which the Regency did undoubtedly belong to the Prince of *Condé*. And thus you see upon what grounds these Wars began : and if they were after that continued during the majority of that same King, and his Successors, their Case in that was more to be pitied, than imitated : for it is known that Wars once beginning, and Jealousies growing strong, and deeply rooted, they are not easily settled.

And to this I shall add what a late Writer of that Church *Sieur d'Ormeigrigny* hath said for them, in his reflections on the *Third Chapter of the Politicks of France* : wherein he justifies the Protestants of *France* from these Imputations. What was done that way, he doth not justify, but chargeth it on *the despair of a lesser Party among them, which was disavowed by the greater part*. And shews how the first Tumults in *Francis II.* his time, were carried mainly on by *Renaudy* a Papist, who had Associates of both Religions. He vindicates what followed from
I
the

the Interest the Princes of the Blood had in the Government in the minority of the Kings. And what followed in *Henry III.* his time, he shews, was in defence of the King of *Navarre*, the righteous heir of the Crown, whom those of the League designed to seclude from his right. But after that *Henry IV.* had settled *France*, he not only granted the Protestants free Exercise of their Religion, but gave them some Towns for their security, to be kept by them for twenty years: at the end whereof, the late King remanding them, the Protestants were instant to keep them longer, to which he yielded for three or four years: in the end, *he wisely determined* (saith that Gentleman) *to take them out of their hands.* Upon which they met in an Assembly at *Rochel*; and most imprudently, he adds, *and against their duty, both to God and the King, they resolved to keep them still by force.* But at that time there was a *National Synod at Alais*, where *M. du Moulin* presided, who searching into the posture of Affairs in that Country, where many of these places of strength lay, he found the greater and better part inclined to yield them up to the King: upon which he wrote an excellent Letter to the *Assembly at Rochel*, dissuading them from pursuing the Courses they were engaging in: where he shews, *it was the general desire of their Churches, that it might please God to continue*
peace

peace by their giving Obedience to the King : and since his Majesty was resolved to have these Places in his own hands, that they would not on that account ingage in a War. But that if Persecution was intended against them, all who feared God desired it might be for the Profession of the Gospel, and so be truly the cross of Christ : and therefore assured them the greater and better part of their Churches desired they would dissolve their meeting, if it could be with security to their Persons. And presses their parting from that Assembly, with many Arguments, and obviates what might be objected against it : And craves pardon to tell them, *They would not find inclinations in those of the Religion to obey their resolutions, which many of the best quality, and greatest capacity avowedly condemned, judging that to suffer on that account, was not to suffer for the Cause of God.* And therefore exhorts them to depend on God, and not precipitate themselves into Ruin by their Impatience. And he ends his Letter with the warmest and ferventest language imaginable for gaining them into his opinion. It is true, his Letter wrought not the desired Effect, yet many upon it deserted the meeting. Upon the which that Gentleman shews, that what was then done, ought not to be charged on the Protestant Churches of France, since it was condemned by the National Synod of their Divines, and three parts of four who were

of the Religion continued in their dutiful Obedience to the King, without ingaging in Arms with those of their Party. *Amirald* also in his incomparable *Apology* for those of the *Reformed Religion*, *Sect. 2.* vindicates them from the imputations of disloyalty to their Prince: and after he hath asserted his own opinion, that Prayers and Tears ought to be the only weapons of the Church, as agreeing best with the nature of the Gospel, and the practice of the first Christians, he adds his regrates, that their Fathers did not crown their other Virtues with invincible Patience, in suffering all the Cruelty of their Persecutors without resistance, after the Example of the Primitive Church, by which all color of reproaching the Reformation had been removed. Yet he shews how they held out during the Reign of *Francis I.* and *Henry II.* notwithstanding all the Cruelty of the Persecution, though their Numbers were great. What fell out after that, he justifies, or rather excuses (for he saith, he cannot praise, but blame it) on the Grounds we have already mentioned, of the minority of their Kings, and of the Interest of the Princes of the Blood. And for the business of *Renaudy* in *Francis II.* his time, he tells how *Calvin* disapproved it: and observes from *Thuan*, that he who first discovered it was of the Reformed Religion, and did it purely from
the

the Dictate of his Conscience. He also shews that the Protestants never made War with a common Consent, till they had the Edicts on their side, so that they defended the King's Authority, which others were violating. But adds withal, that the true cause of the Wars, was reason of State, and a Faction betwixt the Houses of *Bourbon* and *Guise*: and the defence of the Protestants was pretended, to draw them into it. And for the late Wars, he charges the blame of them on the ambition of some of their Grantees, and the factious Inclinations of the Town of *Rochel*. And vindicates the rest of their Church from accession to them, whatever good wishes the common Interest of their Religion might have drawn from them, for these whose danger they so much apprehended. And for the Affairs of our *Britain*, which was then in a great Combustion, for which the Protestants were generally blamed, as if the Genius of their Religion led to an opposition of Monarchy, he saith, strangers could not well judge of matters so remote from them; but if the King of *England* was by the constitutions of that Kingdom a Sovereign Prince (which is a thing in which he cannot well offer a decision) then he simply condemns their raising a War against him, even though that report which was so much spread of his design to change the Reformed Religion settled there,

were true. Neither are these opinions of *Amirald* to be look'd on as his private thoughts ; but that Apology being published by the approbation of these appointed to license the Books of the Religion, is to be received as the more common and received Doctrine of that Church.

And what ever approbation or assistance the neighboring Princes might have given the Protestants in the latter or former Wars, it will not infer their allowing the Precedent of Subjects resisting their Sovereign, though persecuted by him, since it is not to be imagined many Princes could be guilty of that. But the Maxims of Princes running too commonly upon grounds very different from the Rules of Conscience, and tending chiefly to strengthen themselves, and weaken their Neighbors, we are not to make any great account of their approving or abetting of these Wars. And thus far you have drawn from me a great deal of Discourse for justifying the *Conformists* design of vindicating the Reformed Churches from the Doctrine and Practice of Subjects resisting their Sovereign, upon pretexts of Religion.

Ifot. A little time may produce an Answer to all this, which I will not now attempt, but study these accounts more accurately. But let us now come home to *Scotland*, and examine whether the King be an accountable Prince, or not? You
know

know well enough how *Fergus* was first called over by the *Scots*, how many instances there are of the States their coërcing the King, how the King must swear at his Coronation to observe the Laws of the Kingdom, upon which Allegiance is sworn to him, so that if he break his part, why are not the Subjects also free, since the Compact seems mutual? I need not add to this, that the King can neither make nor abrogate Laws, without the consent of the Estates of Parliament, that he can impose no Tax without them. And from these things it appears that the King of *Scotland* is a limited King, who as he originally derived his Power from their choice, so is still limited by them, and liable to them. All which is at large made out by the Author of *Jus populi*.

Basil. Now you are on a rational Point, which I acknowledge deserves to be well discussed, for if by the Laws of *Scotland* the King be liable to his People, then their coërcing him will be no Rebellion. But this point is to be determined not from old Stories, about which we have neither Record, nor clear account for giving light how to direct our belief, nor from some tumultuary Practices, but from the Laws and Records of the Kingdom: and here the first word of our Laws gives a shrewd Indication that the King's Power is not from the People, (which is *anno*

1004, according to Sir John Skeen's Collection of them :) King Malcome gave and distributed all his Lands of the Realm of Scotland among his men, and reserved nothing in property to himself but the Royal Dignity, and the Mute-hill in the Town of Scone.

Now I dare appeal to any Person whether this be not the Stile of a Sovereign, and if this prove not the King's Title to the Crown to be of another nature, than that of a voluntary Compact? The next vestige is to be found in the Books of *Regiam Majestatem*, held to be published by King David I. Anno 1124, and declared authentical by following Parliaments, where the third Verse of the Preface is, *That our most glorious King having the Government of the Realm, may happily live both in the time of Peace and of warfare, and may rule the Realm committed to him by God, who hath no Superior but the Creator of Heaven and Earth, ruler over all things, &c.* And let the plain sense of these words tell whether the King of Scotland, hath his power from the People, and whether he be accountable to any but to God? It is also clear that all were bound to follow the King to the Wars, and punishment was decreed against those who refused it, see the Laws of Alexander II. Cap. 15. and *Jac. 1. Parl. 1. Cap. 4. Jac. 2. p. 13. Cap. 57.* And this shews they were far from allowing War

War against the King. The Parliaments were also originally the Kings Courts, at which all his Vassals were bound to appear personally, and give him Counsel; which proving a burden to the small Barons, they were dispenced with for their appearance in Parliament, 1. *Jac. Parl. 7. cap. 101.* which shews that the coming to the Parliament was looked on in these days rather as an homage due to the King, than a priviledg belonging to the Subjects, otherwise they had been loth to have parted with it so easily. And 2. *Jac. 6. Parl. cap. 14.* *It is ordained that none rebel against the King's person nor his Authority, and whoso makes such Rebellion is to be punished after the quality and quantity of such Rebellion by the advice of the three Estates. And if it happens any within the Realm openly or notoriously to rebel against the King, or make war against the King's Lieges, against his forbidding; in that case the King is to go upon them with assistance of the whole Lands, and to punish them after the quantity of the trespass.* Here see who hath the Sovereign power, and whether any may take Arms against the King's command: and the 25. *Ch. of that same Parl.* defines the points of Treason. It is true by that Act those who assault Castles, or Houses where the King's person was, without the consent of the three Estates, are to be punished as Traytors: From which one may infer that the Estates may besiege the King; but it is clear

clear that was only a provision against these who in the minority of the Kings used to seize upon their Persons, and so assumed the Government: and therefore it was very reasonable that in such a case provision should be made, that it were not Treason for the Estates to come and besiege a place where the Kings Person were for recovering him from such as treasonably seized on him. And this did clearly take its rise from the confusions were in that King's minority, whom sometimes the Governor, sometimes the Chancellor got into their keeping, and so carried things as they pleased having the young King in their hands. The King is also declared to have full Jurisdiction and free Empire within his Realm, 3. *Jac. Parl. 5. cap. 30.* And all along it is to be observed that in asserting his Majesties *Prerogative Royal*, the phrases of *asserting* and *acknowledging*, but never of *giving* or *granting*, are used, so that no part of the King's Prerogative is granted him by the Estates, and *Jac. 6. Parl. 8. cap. 129.* his Majesties Royal Power and Authority over all Estates, as well spiritual as temporal, within the Realm, is ratified, approved, and perpetually confirmed in the person of the King's Majesty his Heirs and Successors. And in the 15. *Parl.* of that same King, *Chap. 251.* these words are, *Albeit it cannot be denied, but his Majesty is a free Prince,*
of

of a Sovereign Power, having as great liberties and Prerogatives by the Laws of this Realm and priviledg of his Crown, and Diadem, as any other King, Prince, or Potentate whatsoever. And in the 18. Parl. of the same King, Act. 1. The Estates and whole body of that present Parliament, all in one voluntary, faithful and united heart, mind and consent, did truly acknowledg his Majesties Sovereign Authority, Princely Power, Royal Prerogative, and priviledg of his Crown over all Estates, Persons and Causes within his said Kingdom By this time I suppose it is past debate, that by the Tract of the whole Laws of Scotland, his Majesty is a Sovereign unaccountable Prince, since nothing can be devised more expresse than are the Acts I have cited. For what you objected from the Coronation Oath, remember what was said a great while ago, that if by the Coronation the King got his Power, so that the Coronation Oath, and Oath of Allegiance were of the nature of a mutual stipulation, then you might with some reason infer that a failing of the one side, did free the other; but nothing of that can be alledged here, where the King hath his Authority, how soon the breath of his Father goes out, and acts with full Regal power before he be crowned; so that the Coronation is only a solemn inauguration in that which is already his right. Next, let me tell you, that the King's swearing

at

at his Coronation, is but a late practice; and so the Title of the Kings of *Scotland* to the Crown, is not upon the swearing of that Oath : And here I shall tell you all that I can find in our Laws of the King's swearing or promising. The first instance that meets me is, *Chap. 17. of the Statutes of King Robert the Second*, where these words are, *For fulfilling and observing of all the premises, the King so far as concerns him in his Parliament, hath obliged himself in the word of a Prince, and his Son the Earl of Carriët (afterwards Robert the third) being constituted by the King for fulfilling of the premises, so far as touches him, gave and made his Oath, the holy Evangelis being touched by him, and then the States of Parliament did also swear to maintain the Earl of Carriët, made then Lieutenant under the King.* Now the reason why these mutual Oaths were then given, is well known, since the King's Succession was so doubtful. But after that, no Oath seems to have been given : and tho King *James the Second* his Coronation be set down in the Records of Parliament, there is not a word of an Oath given by any in his Name. It is true in the *11. Parl. of that King, cap. 41.* for securing of the Crown-lands from being alienated, it is appointed, *That the King who then was, should be sworn; and in like manner all his Successors, Kings of Scotland into their Coronation, to the keeping of that*
Statute,

Statute, and all the points thereof. But this is not such an Oath as you alledg. Likewise in King James the Fourth his Reign, 2. Parl. Ch. 12. where the Council was sworn, it is added, *And our Sovereign Lord hath humbled his Highness to promise and grant in Parliament, to abide and remain at their Counsels while the next Parliament.* But it is to be observed, the King was then but 17 years old, and so not of full age: this promise was also a temporary provision. Besides, the very stile of it shews, that it was below his Majesty to be so bound. But the first Act for a Coronation Oath I can meet with, is Cap. 8. of the 1. Parl. of King James the Sixth, An. 1567. where the stile wherein the Act runs, shews it was a new thing, it bearing no narrative of any such former Custom: the words of the Act are, *Item, because that the increase of Vertue and suppressing of Idolatry craves, that the Prince and the people be of one perfect Religion, which of GOD'S mercy is now presently professed within this Realm; Therefore it is statute and ordained by our Sovereign Lord, my Lord Regent, and the three Estates of this present Parliament, that all Kings and Princes, or Magistrates whatsoever, holding their place, which hereafter may happen to Reign, and bear Rule over this Realm, at the time of their Coronation, and receipt of their Princely authority, make their faithful promise by Oath, &c.* Now you see the beginning of the Coro-

Coronation Oath, and I need not here reflect on the time when that Act passed, it being so obvious to every one. But I suppose it is made out, that the Kings of *Scotland* have not their Authority from any stipulation used at their Coronation. The next thing you alledg to prove the King of *Scotland* a limited Prince, is, because he must govern by Laws, which cannot be enacted without the Authority of the three Estates in Parliament: But this will not serve turn, unless you prove that the Estates can cognosce on the King, and coerce him if he transgress: for which there is not a tittle in our Laws. I acknowledg the Constitution of Parliaments to be both a rational and excellent Model, and that the King becomes a Tyrant when he violates their Priviledges, and governs without Law: But tho his Ministers who serve him in such tyrannical ways are liable to punishment by the Law, yet himself is subject to none but *G O D*. And from our Kings their Justice and goodness in governing legally by the Councils of their Parliaments, you have no reason to argue against their absolute Authority; for their binding themselves to such Rules, and being tied to the observance of Laws enacted by themselves, will never overthrow their Authority, but rather commend it, as having such a temperature of Sovereignty, Justice, and Goodness in it.

Ifot.

Isot. But was not King *James* the Third resisted and killed in the Field of *Striveling*, and afterwards in his Sons first *Parl. Act.* 14. all who were against him in that Field, were declared innocent, and his slaughter was declared to be his own fault, which was never rescinded? As also *Cap.* 130. of *Jac.* 6. *Parl.* 8. the Honour and Authority of Parliament upon the free Vote of the three Estates thereof is asserted. And are not you an impugner of the Authority of the three Estates, who plead thus for the King's Sovereign Power? See *Answer to the Letter written to the Author of Jus Populi.*

Basil. I shall not engage far in the Story of King *James* the Third, which even as it is represented by *Buchanan*, lib. 11. (no friend to Monarchy) is very far from being justifiable on the side of those who fought against him: nor was it the least part of their guilt, that they forced his Son, being then but fifteen years old, to own their Rebellion: And what wonder was it, that they who had killed the Father, and kept his Son in their power, passed such an Act in their own favors? But King *James* the Fourth quickly discovered what a sincere Penitent he was for his Accession to that Rebellion, as appeared by the Iron Belt he wore all his life, as a penance for this sin: yet the meekness of his Spirit, and the power of that Faction, made that things

things continued in the posture they formerly were in. It is true, that Act was not expressly repelled, which perhaps was not safe at that time to have attempted: but it was really done by his Revocation ratified in his 6. *Parl. cap. 100.* wherein with consent of the three Estates, *He annuls and revokes all Statutes and Acts of Parliament which he had enacted in his former years, that tended either to the prejudice of the Catholic Church, his Soul, or of the Crown, declaring them to have no force, but to be deleted, and cancell'd out of the Books.* And it is not to be doubted, but in this he had an eye to that former Act: but for your Act asserting the Authority of Parliament, look but what immediately precedes it, and you will find the King's Authority and Supremacy fully established: and I acknowledg, that whosoever impugns the Authority of Parliament, as the King's Great Council, doth incur a very high punishment; but this will never prove an Authority in the States to coerce and resist the King. One thing I must mind you of from that Act, which is, *That none of the Lieges must presume to impugn the dignity and Authority of the said three Estates, or to seek or procure the innovation, or diminution of the Power and Authority of the same three Estates, or any of them in time coming, under the pain of Treason.* And can you be so ignorant of our Laws, as not to know that the Church

was one of these Estates: for the small Barons which some called the Third Estate, came not in till three years after? *Jac. 6. Parl. II. cap. 113.* And now from all these premises, I think we may fairly infer with Sir *John Skeen*, Title 8. of the heads of our Laws drawn up by him, *That all Jurisdiction stands and consists in the King's Person by reason of his Royal Authority and Crown, and is competent to no Subject, but flows and proceeds from the King, having Supreme Jurisdiction, and is given and committed by him to such Subjects as he pleases.*

Eud. I must confess my self pleased with this discussion of these points you have been tossing among you: and though I have sate silent, yet I have followed the thread of all your discourse with much close attention; and was mightily confirmed in my former Perswasion, both by the evidence of Reason, the authorities of Scripture, and these instances of History were adduced. But there are many other things yet to be talked of, though I confess this be of the greatest Importance: and the satisfaction I have received in this, makes me long to hear you handle the other matters in debate.

Phil. I suppose we have forgot little that belonged to this question: but for engaging further at this time, I have no mind to it, it being so long passed Midnight: we shall therefore

K

give

give some truce to our debates, and return upon the next appointment.

Eud. I were unworthy of the kindness you shew me, did I importune you too much: but I will presume upon your friendship for me, to expect your company to Morrow at the same hour you did me the favor to come here to day.

Isot. I shall not fail to keep your hour, tho I be hardly beset in such a croud of Assailants; but Truth is on my side, and it is great, and shall prevail, therefore good night to you.

Basil. I see you are not shaken out of your confidence for all the foils you get, yet our next days discourse will perhaps humble you a little more; but I refer this to the appointment wherein we hope to meet again, and so, Adieu.

Eud. Adieu, to you all, my good Friends.

THE SECOND CONFERENCE.

Eudaimon.

YOU are again welcome to this place, and so much the more, that your staying some minutes later than the appointment, was making me doubt of your coming: and indeed this delay proved more tedious, and seemed longer to me than the many hours were bestowed on your yesterdays *Conference*: but methinks, *Isotimus*, your looks, though never very serene, have an unusual Cloud upon them; I doubt you have been among the *Brotherhood*, whom your ingenious Relation of what passed here, hath offended. Their Temper is pretty well known to us all, some of them being *as the Pestilence that walketh in darkness*, with the no less zealous, but scarcely more ignorant, *Sisterhood*, they vent their peddling stuff: but of all things in the World shun most to engage

K 2

with

with any that can unmask them, and discover their follies. And their safest way of dealing with such Persons, is, to laugh at them, or solemnly to pity them with a disdainful Brow. And that is the best refutation they will bestow on the solideſt Reason, or if any of them yelp out with an Answer, ſenſe or nonſenſe, all is alike; the premiſes are never examined, only if the concluſion be poſitively vouched, as clearly proved from Scriptures and Reason, the ſentence is irreverſibly paſt, and you may as ſoon bow an Oak of an hundred years old, as deal with ſo much ſupercilious Ignorance. Tell plainly, have you been in any ſuch Company?

Iſot. What wild extravagant ſtuff pour you out on better men than your ſelf? but I pity your ignorance who know not ſome of theſe precious Worthies, whoſe Shooe Latchets you are not worthy to unlooſe. But the truth is, you have got me here among you, and bait me by turns, either to eaſe your own Galls, or to try mine; yet it is needleſs to attempt upon me, for as I am not convinced by your Reaſons, ſo I will not be behind with you in Reflections: and I will crow and fight both, as a Cock of the Game.

Baſil. Hold, hold, for theſe ſerve to no uſe but to rankle peeviſh humors, I will therefore engage

engage you in another subject about the Civil Authority, which our yesterdays debate left untouched; which is *the obedience due to their Commands: let us therefore consider how far Subjection obligeth us to obey the Laws of the Civil Powers.*

Isot. Had you not enough of that yesterday? Is it not enough that the Magistrate be not resisted? but will not that serve turn with you? or do you design that we surrender our Consciences to him, and obey all his Laws, good or bad, and follow *Leviathan's* Doctrine of embracing the Magistrates Faith without enquiry? which is bravely asserted by the *Author of Ecclesiastical Policy*. This is indeed to make the King in God's stead, and to render *Cesar* the things that are God's, which is a visible design either for Popery or Atheism.

Philar. Truly, Sir, you consider little, if you judge submission to the Penalties of the Laws, to be all the duty we owe Superiors. It is true, where the Legislators leave it to the Subjects choice, either to do a thing enacted, or to pay a Fine; in that Case, Obedience is not simply required; so that he who pays the Mulct, fulfils his Obligation. But where a Law is simply made, and Obedience enjoined, and a Penalty fixed on Disobedience, in that Case, nothing but the sinfulness of the Command can

excuse our disobedience : neither can it be said, that he sins not who is content to submit to the punishment, since by the same method of arguing you may prove that such horrid Atheists, as say they are content to be damned, do not sin against God, since they are willing to submit to the threatned punishment. The right of exacting our Obedience is therefore to be distinguished from the power of punishing our faults. And as we have already considered how far the latter is to be acquiesced in, it remains to be examined what is due to the former. But here I lay down for a Principle, *That whatever is determined by the Law of God, cannot be reversed, nor countermanded by any humane Law*: For the Powers that are, being ordained of God, and they being his Ministers, do act as his Deputies: and the tie which lies on us to obey God, being the foundation of our subjection to them, it cannot bind us to that which overthrows it self: Therefore it is certain God is first to be obeyed; and all the Laws of men which contradict his Authority or Commands, are null, and void of all obligation on our Obedience: but I must add, it is one of the arts of *you know whom*, to fasten Tenets on men who judge these Tenets worthy of the highest *Anathema*. For if it be maintained, that the Magistrate can bind obligations on our Consciences, then

then it will be told in every Conventicle, that here a new Tyranny is brought upon Souls, which are God's Prerogative, though this be nothing more than to say we ought *to be subject for Conscience sake*. If again it be proved that the determining of the externals of Government or Worship, falls within the Magistrate's Sphere, then comes in a new Complaint, and it is told, that here Religion is given up to the Lusts and Pleasure of men, though it be an hundred times repeated, that command what the King will in prejudice of the Divine Law, no Obedience is due. If again it be proved that Church Judicatories, in what notions soever, are subjects, as well as others, and no less tied to obedience than others; upon this come in vehement outcries, as if the Throne and Kingdom of *Christ* were overturned and betrayed, with other such like Expressions in their harsh Stile. What is become of Mankind and of Religion, when Ignorants triumph upon these barren Pretences, as if they were the only Masters of Reason, and directors of Conscience? You know what my Temper is in most differences: but I acknowledge my mind to be full of a just disdain of these ignorant, and insolent Pedlers; which is the more inflamed, when I consider the Ruins, not only of sound Learning, but of true Piety, and the common rules of Humanity,

which follow these simple Contests they make about nothing.

Basil. To speak freely, I cherish Reflections no where, therefore I shall not conceal my dislike of these Invectives, which though I am forced to confess, are just; yet I love to hear truth and peace pleaded for with a calm serene Temper: and though the intolerable and peevish railings of these Pamphlets do justify a severe Procedure, yet I would have the softer and milder methods of the Gospel used, that so we may *overcome evil with good.* To take you therefore off that angry engagement, let me invite you to a sober Examen of the Magistrates Authority in things Divine. But before this be engaged in, let it be first considered whether there be any Legislative Power on Earth about things Sacred: and next, with whom it is lodged.

Isot. I will so far comply with your desires, that for this once without retaliating, I quit to *Philarcheus* the last word of scolding. But to come to the purpose you have suggested, consider that *Christ* hath given us a complete Rule, wherein *are all things that pertain to Life and Godliness.* It is then an Imputation on his Gospel, to say any thing needs be added to it, and that it contains not a clear direction for all things; therefore they accuse his Wisdom or Goodness, who pretend to add to his Laws, and wherein he

he hath not burthened our Consciences: what tyranny is it to bind *a yolk upon us which our Fathers were not able to bear*? Whereby as our Christian liberty is invaded, so innumerable Schisms and Scandals spring from no other thing so much, as from these oppressions of Conscience, which are so much the more unjust, that the imposers acknowledging their indifferency, and the refusers scrupling their lawfulness, the peace of the Church is sacrificed to what is acknowledged indifferent: neither can any bounds be fixed to those impositions; for if one particular may be added, why not more and more still, till the yolk become heavier than that of *Moses* was? which is made out from experience: For the humor of innovating in divine matters having once crept into the Church, it never stopp'd till it swelled to that prodigious bulk of Rites, under which the *Roman Church* lies oppressed. And besides all these general considerations, there is one particular against significant Rites, which is, that the instituting of them in order to a particular signification of any Grace, makes them Sacraments, according to the vulgar definition of Sacraments, that they are the outward signs of an inward Grace: but the instituting of Sacraments, is by the confession of all, a part of Christ's Prerogative, since he who confers grace, can only institute the
signs

signs of it. Upon all these accounts, I plead the Rule of Scripture to be that which ought to determine about all divine matters, and that no binding Laws ought to be made in divine things wherein we are left at liberty by G O D, who is the only Master of our Consciences. *See from pag. 172. to pag. 180.*

Phil. You have now given me a full Broad-side, after which I doubt not but you triumph as if you had shattered me all to pieces: but I am afraid you shall find this Volley of chained Ball hath quite missed me, and that I be aboard of you ere you be aware. No man can with more heartiness acknowledg the compleatness of Scripture than my self: and one part of it is, that all things which tend to Order, Edification and Peace be done, and the Scene of the World altering so, that what now tends to advance Order, Edification, and Peace, may afterwards occasion disorder; destruction and contention, the Scripture had not been compleat, if in these things there were not an Authority on Earth, to make and unmake Laws in things indifferent. I acknowledg the *adding of new pieces of worship*, hath so many inconveniencies hanging about it, that I should not much patronize it: but the determining of what may be done, either in this or that fashion to any particular Rule, is not of that nature: Therefore, since Worship must be
in

in a certain posture, a certain habit, in a determinate place, and on such times, all these being of one kind; Laws made about them upon the accounts of order, edification, or peace, do not pretend to prejudg the perfection of Scripture, by any additions to what it prescribes; since no new thing is introduced: Indeed did humane Law-givers pretend that by their Laws these things became of their own nature more acceptable to G O D, they should invade G O D's Prerogative; but when they are prescribed only upon the account of Decency and Order, it is intolerable peevishness to call a thing indifferent of its nature, unlawful, because commanded: For the Christian liberty consists in the exemption of our Consciences from all humane yolk, but not of our actions, which are still in the power of our Superiors, till they enjoin what is sinful, and then a greater than they is to be obeyed. I acknowledg, the simplicity of the *Christian Religion* is one of its chief Glories, nothing being enjoined in it but what is most properly fitted for advancing the Souls of men towards that wherein their blessedness doth consist: And therefore I never reflect without wonder, on that Censure *Ammian Marcellin*, a Heathen Writer, gives of *Constantius*, *That he confounded the Christian Religion, which was of it self pure and simple, with doating superstitions.*

So

So I freely acknowledg that whosoever introduce new parts of Worship, as if they could commend us to GOD, do highly encroach on GOD's Authority, and man's Liberty. But as for the determining of things that may be done in a variety of ways into one particular form, such as the prescribing a set form for Worship, the ordering the posture in Sacraments, the habit in Worship, determinate times for commemorating great mercies, the time how long a Sinner must declare his penitence, ere he be admitted to the use of the Sacraments, and the like (which is all in question among us) they are quite of another nature. And it is a strange piece of nicety, if in these things, because Superiours command what seems most proper for expressing the inward sense we ought to have of things, that therefore these injunctions become criminal, and not to be obeyed. For the significancy alledged to be in them, is only a dumb way of expressing our inward thoughts; and as we agree to express them by words, so some outward signs may be also used: as by sackcloth the penitent expresseth his sorrow, and by a Surplice a Church-man expresseth his purity; so those habits are only a silent way of speaking out the sense of the heart. Only here on the way, if you have a mind to ease your spleen a little, read what that late Pamphlet
saith

faith, to prove a distinction betwixt these two Ceremonies, pag. 111. That vulgar Sophism of making Sacraments, is the poorest Cavil imaginable: for a Sacrament is a federate Rite of stipulating with *G O D*, wherein as we plight our faith to *G O D*, so he visibly makes offer of his Gospel to us, which he accompanies with the gracious effusions of his Spirit: and indeed to institute any such Rite, were the highest encroachment on the divine Authority: But what Sophistry will fasten a pretension to this on the institution of a Right, which shall only signifie that Duty a creature owes his Maker and Redeemer, tending both to quicken the person that performs it to a sence of it, as also to work upon Spectators by such a grave solemn Rite? To say Men can institute means of conveying the divine Grace, is justly to be condemned; but how far differs it from that, to use signs, as well as words, for expressing our duty to *G O D*? Thus you see how ill founded that pompous Argument is, with which we have heard many triumphing among Ignorants, or where none could contradict them.

Crit. If I may have liberty to add a little, I would suggest somewhat of the true Notion of *Christian Liberty*, and how it is to be made use of, or restrained. For the clearing whereof, we are to call to mind how upon the first promulgation
of

of the Gospel, a Contention did early rise about the observation of *Moses Law*, the stipulation whereto was given in Circumcision; the *Judaizers* pleaded its continuance, and the *Apostles* asserted the *Christian Liberty*: the *Judaizers* pretended a divine Obligation from *Moses his Law*; the *Apostles* proved that was now vacated by the death of CHRIST, which freed all from that Yoak, and that therefore to be circumcised, as a stipulation to *Moses's Law*, was to continue subject to that Yoak, and so to deny the *Messias* was yet come, by which CHRIST should profit them nothing. But the authority of *Paul* and *Barnabas* not being great enough to settle that Question, they were sent from *Antioch* to the *Apostles*, and *Presbyters* at *Jerusalem*, who determined against the necessity of Circumcision, and consequently of the observation of the *Mosaical Law*, and appointed that these who were profelyted from *Gentilism* to the *Christian Faith*, should be received, not as *Profelytes of Justice*, but as *Profelytes of the Gates*, who were only bound to obey the seven Precepts of the *Sons of Noah*; which I stand not to make out, it being sufficiently cleared already by others. Here then the *Christian Liberty* was stated in an exemption from the *Law of Moses*. But for all this, we see into what compliances the *Apostles* consented, for gaining upon the *Jews* by that con-

condescension, they Circumcise, they Purifie (which was done by sprinkling with the ashes of the red Cow) they take the Vows of *Nazarism*, they keep the Feasts at *Jerusalem* (which I wonder how that Pamphleteer could deny, pag. 301. it being mentioned expressely, *Acts* 18. 21.) and upon the whole matter Saint *Paul* gives the following Rules and Assertions.

The first was, that these things did not commend a Man to GOD: *For the Kingdom of GOD consisted not in meat and drink*, (which clearly relates to the *Mosaical* differencing of Meats, clean and unclean) *that neither Circumcision nor uncircumcision availed anything*. And if neither branch of that Controversie did of its own nature commend men to GOD; what judgments may we pass on our trifling wranglings? Whence we may infer, that we ought to instruct all *Christians in the Faith*, but not in these doubtful Disputations.

The next Assertion is, That even in these matters men might be acceptable to GOD, on which side soever they were, so they judged what they did was done to GOD. He that made distinction of Days, or Meats, *made it to the LORD*, and he that regarded them not to the LORD, he regarded them not. So that GOD may be acceptably served by several men

men doing things contrary one to another.

Another Rule is, That in these things every Man must be fully persuaded in his own mind, and proceed out of a clear conviction in his Conscience.

A fourth Rule is, That in these matters none ought to prescribe or dictate to another: such as had a liberty in them, were not to despise the scrupulous, as unreasonable; neither were these who scrupled at them, to judg such as acted in a higher Sphere of Liberty, as profane or licentious: so that all were to be remitted to *G O D's Judgment Seat.*

Another Rule is, That for *the Peace of the Church*, many things which are otherwise subject to great inconveniencies, may be done for the gaining our Brethren: but if such compliance harden people in their imperious humor, what was formerly to be done for gaining upon them, becomes unfit when so abused by them; and therefore if after we have complied with the weak exceptions of others, in matters indifferent, they become so hardy as to presume upon our goodness to invade our Liberty, by enjoying such things as necessary, pretending to an authority over us; *we are not to give place by subjection to such, no not for an hour.*

The last Rule is, That in matters of indifferency, we are to postpone our own inclinations or desires

desires, when the hazard of our brother's stumbling, or of the Peace of the Church lies in our way.

All these are so clearly asserted by *S. Paul*, and withal are so opposite to our present Heats, that I wish they were more minded by the troublers of our *Israel*, and they would certainly give a speedy decision to these Feuds about doubtful disputations, which have so long preyed on the *Peace of the Church*.

Basil. And I am sure if so great a Compliance may be given to the weakness of our brethren, much more is due to the commands of our Superiors; except you say, we are more subject to equals than to Superiors, or that the weakness of a Brother should weigh more than the authority of a Father: And in fine, that the Obligations of *Charity* should be more prevalent than those of *Justice*; *Obedience* being a debt we owe, whereas *Compliance* is a Benevolence given. I do not deny but great caution and tenderness must be used in making of such Laws, and that their fitness for attaining the ends of *order, edification and peace*, should be well considered, and they no longer adhered to, than these effects can be drawn from them: so that if the nature of Circumstances which vary all things indifferent, come to change, the same reason that exacted their being first imposed, will plead a

L

change.

change. I also acknowledge, that great abuse hath followed upon the innovating and prescribing in *Divine matters*, and that nothing hath occasioned more *divisions among Christians*, than the overstraining an *Uniformity*. But if because of abuses you over-turn all *Legislative Power* in matters sacred, nothing that is humane shall scape your fury, since every thing is subject to abuse. And nothing will curb ones Career till he turn *Quaker*, that follows these Maxims. But one thing is still forgotten, that the *dictates of Reason* are in their kind the *Voice of God*; Reason being nothing, save an impress of the Image of God on the Soul of man; which because much obliterated by the Fall, was to be supplied by Revelation: but wherein it remains clear, its directions not contradicting any positive or revealed Law, are still to be followed as the Laws of God.

Poly. For proving all this, I shall not run so far back as to examine the nature of the *Priesthood*, and *Sacrifices* were before Moses, to consider whether these flow'd from a *Revelation* conveyed by *Tradition*, or from the *dictates of Reason*? But after *Moses his Law* was given, wherein all was modelled by *Divine prescript*, yet what a vast heap of *additions* did flow upon that worship before our Saviour's days, all that have written on the Temple service do abundantly discover.

Here

Here is a Field spacious enough for any that designed a vain shew of much reading, but a view of *Doctor Lightfoot's Temple-Service* will quickly convince any, that the whole Service of the Temple was interpalated by many Additions, whose first Author cannot be traced. They also used *Baptism* to all who were profelyted from *Gentilism*. And in the *Paschal Festivity* alone, how many new Rites do we find? Every School-boy may know that they had a Dish, called *Charafeth*, which was a thick Sawce of Dates, Figs, Almonds, &c. pounded together, which looked like Clay, to mind them of the Clay in which their Fathers wrought in *Egypt*, which was a significative Ceremony; and was the Dish wherein they dipped their hand, which we find was not wanting in our *Lord's Passover*; which proves significant Rites, tho of humane appointment, cannot be criminal. And if to this I should add the several Cups of Wine, the divers removes of the Table, and covering it of new, the frequent washing of their hands, and divers other things, I should grow tedious. But our *Lord* never reproves these things; nay, on the contrary he symbolized with them. It is true, when their Zeal for their *Traditions* made them break the *Commandments* of God, or adhere so stiffly to them, as to judge the Consciences of such as did not comply with them in

the use of them, then he checks their Hypocrisie, and accuses them, not for the use of these things, but because they placed all Religion in them, and imposed the Precepts of men as doctrines. To this I might add the whole frame of the *Synagogues*, both as to *Government*, *Discipline* and *Worship*: for whatsoever scraps may be brought which may seem to prove there were *Synagogues* before the Captivity, which yet is much controverted; yet the form of *Government* in them, the rules of *Excommunication*, and its degrees, together with their *Philacteries*, and set forms of *Worship*, will never be proved from *Scripture*. Now since the *Law* of God was no less perfect in the *Old Dispensation*, than the *Gospel* is now, it will follow that *Additions* in things purely external and ritual, do no way detract from the Word of God: For nothing can be brought to prove the *New Testament* a complete Rule for *Christians*, which will not plead the same full authority to the *Old Testament*, during that *Dispensation*; since though the *Dispensation* was imperfect, yet the Revelation of God to them was able to make them perfect and thoroughly furnished for every good work: and the *Scriptures* which S. Paul saith, were able to make wise to salvation, can be no other than the *Old Testament writings*. For besides that by *Scriptures* nothing else is understood in the *New*

Testa-

Testament, there could be no other *Scripture* known to *Timothy* of a Child, but these of the *Old Testament*. If then they trespass upon the authority of the *New Testament*, and its blessed Author, who assert a Power to determine about Rituals in Worship, or other matters of *Religion*; they committed the same Crime who pretended to add to what *Moses* prescribed, since he was also faithful in all his house. Or if any plead a Divine Warrant for these Institutions which were traditionally conveyed, this will open a door for all the pretences of the *Roman Church*, since the Expressions that cancel *Traditions*, are as full in the *Old Testament*, as in the *New*. And thus far I think I have evinced, that there were great additions in Rituals made by the *Jews*, and that these were not unlawful, since complied with by him who never did amiss, and yet these could have no higher original than humane Authority. I go on to the *New Dispensation*, wherein I doubt not to evince, that as for rituals, most of these they found in the *Synagogue* were retained, without any other change than what that *Dispensation* drew after it, and that they took both the Rules of Government, Worship and Discipline from the *Synagogue*. Therefore the *Epistles* do not, when treating of these matters, speak in their Stile, who are instituting new things; but of those who are giving

directions about what was already received and known : For if new rules had been to be delivered, the Institution had been exprefs, either in the *Gospels*, *Acts*, or *Epistles*. Now if any will read these without prejudice, no fuch thing will appear : of which manner of Stile, no account can be given ; but that things, as to Rituals continued as they were, the use of the Sacraments being only instituted by *Christ*, where the Language of an Institution is exprefs.

About two hundred years after *Christ*, outward Penitence was brought into the Church, and scandalous Persons were, according to the nature of Scandals, debarred from the Sacrament for a long space, and were by degrees, and according to the heighth of their Penitence, received to the Communion of the Church, but not after some years had passed in outward professions of Penitence : and the modelling of this became after that, the chief Care of *Synods* for divers Centuries. Now if one will argue, that though it be true a scandalous Person should be excommunicated ; yet since *God* hath mercy at whatsoever time a Sinner repents, so should the Church (which only judgeth of the Profession) forgive at whatsoever time one professeth Penitence. It will not be easie in your Principles to answer this : and see how you will clear this practice of Discipline from Tyranny, since

since to debar men from the *Sacraments*, is a greater dominion over Consciences than the determining about Rituals.

But to come nearer home, there was a certain Society you have heard of *ycleped the Kirk*, which had divers Books of Discipline containing rules for that, and a Directory for Worship, which had no few rules neither : they had also a frame of Government, the Supreme Judicatory whereof was composed of three Ministers, and one ruling Elder from each Presbytery, a ruling Elder beside from each Burrough, two being allowed the Metropolis, and a Commissioner was sent from each University; and in this High Court the King came in with the Privilege of a Burgh : for though the Metropolis had two, he was allowed to send but one with a single Suffrage to represent him; and this Court pretended to an Authority from *Christ*, and their Authority was Sacred with no less certificate, than *he that despiseth you, despiseth me*. Now how a Power can be committed to delegates without any Commission for it from the Superior, will not be easily made out. And they will search long ere they find a Divine Warrant for this Court, unless they vouch *Mary Mitchelsons Testimony* for it, whose hysterical Distempers were given out for Prophecies. And whereas they are so tender of *Christian Liberty*, that no

Law must pass about the Rituals of Religion, yet their Books of Discipline and Model of Government, were not only settled by Law, but afterwards sworn to be maintained in the Covenant, wherein they swore *the Preservation of the Reformed Religion in Scotland, in Doctrine, Worship, Discipline and Government*. These were the tender Consciences that could not hear of any Law in *matters indifferent*, and yet would have all swear to their Forms, many of which they could not but know were indifferent: which was a making them necessary at another rate, than is done by a Law which the Legislator can repeal when he will: and never were any in the world more addicted to their own Forms than they were. An instance of this I will give, which I dare say will surprise you: When some designers for popularity in the *Western* parts of that Kirk, did begin to disuse the *Lord's Prayer* in Worship, and the singing the *Conclusion or Doxology* after the *Psalms*, and the *Minister's kneeling for private Devotion* when he entered the Pulpit, the *General Assembly* took this in very ill part, and in a Letter they wrote to the Presbyteries, complained sadly, *Of a Spirit of Innovation was beginning to get into the Kirk, and to throw these laudible practices out of it, mentioning the three I named, which are commanded to be still practised; and such as refused obedience, are appointed to be conferr'd with in order to the*
giving

giving of them satisfaction: and if they continu'd untractable, the Presbyteries were to proceed against them, as they should be answerable to the next general Assembly. This Letter I can produce authentically attested. But is it not strange, that some who were then zealous to condemn these Innovations, should now be carried with the herd to be guilty of them? I am become hoarse with speaking so long, and so I must break off, having, as I suppose, given many great *Précédents* from History for the using of *Rites in divine matters*, without an express Warrant, and for *passing Laws* upon these, and have cleared the one of Superstition, and the other of Tyranny.

End. Truly, all of you have done your parts so well, that even *Isotimus* himself seems half convinced: It is then fully clear, that as nothing is to be obtruded on our Belief without clear revelation; so no sacred duty can be bound on our Obedience without a Divine Warrant: but in Rituals, especially in determining what may be done in a variety of ways to one particular Form, there hath been, and still must be, a Power on Earth; which provided it balance all things right, and consider well the fitness of these Rites, for attaining the designed end, doth not invade *God's* Dominion by making Laws about them: Nor will the pretence of *Christian Liberty* warrant our Disobedience to them.

them. It remains to be considered, who are vested with this Power, and how much of it belongs to the Magistrate, and how much to the Church.

Basil. I now engage in a Theme which may perhaps lay me open to censure, as if I were courting the Civil Powers by the asserting of their rights: but I am too well known to you to dread your jealousy much in this; and I am too little known to my self, if flattery be my foible. I shall therefore with the greatest frankness and ingenuity, lay open my sense of this matter, with the Reasons that prevail with me in it: but I desire first to hear *Isotimus* his opinion about it.

Isot. I do not deny the King hath Authority and Jurisdiction in matters Sacred: but it must be asserted in a due line of Subordination: First, to *Christ* the King of Kings, and the only Head of his Church. And next, to the Rulers and Office bearers of the Church, who are entrusted by *Christ*, as his Ambassadors, with the Souls of their Flocks, and who must give him an account of their Labors; therefore they must have their Rules only from him who empowers them, and to whom they are subject: They must also have a Power among them to preserve the *Christian Society*; in order to which, they must, according to the *practice of the Apostles*,
when

when difficulties emerge, meet together, and consult what may be for the advancement of the *Christian Religion*; and whoso refuseth to hear the Church when she errs not from her Rule, he is to be accounted no better than a *Heathen and a Publican*. And since the Church is called one body, they ought to associate together in meetings, seeing also they have their Power of *Christ*, as Mediator, whereas the *Civil Powers* hold of him as he is *God*, they have a different Tenor, distinct Ends, and various Rules; therefore the Authority of the Church is among the things of *God*, which only belong to him. And indeed Christians were very ill provided for by *Christ*, if they must in matters of Religion be subject to the pleasure of secular and carnal Men, who will be ready to serve their own Interests at the rate of the Ruin of every thing that is Sacred. It is true, the *Civil Powers* may and ought to convocate *Synods* to consult about matters of Religion, to require *Church-men* to do their duty, to add their *Sanctions* to *Church Laws*, and to join with the sounder part for carrying on a *Reformation*. But all this is cumulative to the *Churches intrinsic Power*, and not *privative*; so that if the Magistrate fall short of his duty, they are notwithstanding that, to go on as men empowerd by *Jesus Christ*, and he who despiseth them (be his

qua-

quality what it will) *despisetb him that sent them.*
 See p. 105. to p. 109. and p. 467. to p. 486.

Basil. In order to a clear progress in this matter, I shall first discuss the *nature and power of the Church*, by which a step shall be made to *the Power the Magistrate* may pretend to in matters Sacred. The Apostles being sent by *Jesus Christ*, did every where promulgate the Gospel, and required such as received it, to meet often together for joint Worship, and the free profession of the Faith, wherein they were particularly obliged to the use of the Sacraments. The Apostles, and after them, all Church-men, were also endued with a double Power: The one was declarative for promulgating the Gospel: the other was directive, which properly is no power; and by this they were to advise in such matters wherein they had no warrant to command: So *S. Paul* wrote sometimes his own sense, which he did by *permission*, and not by *commandment*, only he advised, *as one that had obtained mercy to be faithful.* But because *Christ* was to be in *his Church* to the end of the World, the things they had heard were to be committed to *faithful men*, that they might be able to teach others. All Church-men being thus the Successors of the Apostles, they are vested with a *Divine Authority*, for solemn publishing the Gospel; but with this odds from the Apostles, *That whereas they*
were

were infallible, their Successors are subject to error. And the power of Church-men consists formally in this, that they are *Heralds of the Gospel*: and by their preaching it, a solemn offer of it is made to all their hearers, which to despise, is to *despise him that sent them*. But in this power they are bound up to the Commission they have from God, so that what they say beyond that, is none of the divine Message. Yet because many particulars may fall in, about which it was impossible Rules could be given, they have a directive Authority, which if it be managed as *S. Paul* did, we need fear no tyrannical imposition from it. And therefore in these matters their definitions are not binding Laws, but Rules of advice: for in matters wherein we are left at liberty by God, if Church-men pretend to a Dominion over our Souls, they make us the servants of Men. And indeed it is the most incoherent thing imaginable, for these who lay no claim to Infallibility, to pretend to absolute obedience. It is true, the Laws of peace and order bind us to an association, if we be Christians: and therefore we ought to yield in many things for peace: but since we are all a *Royal Priesthood*, why Church-men should pretend to Authority or Jurisdiction, except in that which is expressly in their Commission, wherein they are purely *Heralds*, I do not see. It is true, Christians

stians ought to assemble for Worship, but for the associations of Churches in Judicatories, I cannot imagine in what corner of the *New Testament* that shall be found: In which I am the more confirmed, since all the labor of that Pamphleteer from p 126. to 144. could not find it out. For it is a strange Method to prove a divine Warrant, because some reasons are brought to prove it must be so: to have cited the words, where a shorter and clearer method of proof; since to prove that such a thing must be, and yet not to shew that it is, is only to attempt against the Scripture, for being defective in that which it ought to have contained. But if the phrase of *one body* conclude a proof for Associations, then since the Body includes all Christians, the whole faithful must meet together in Councils. For where have you a difference in that betwixt the Clergy, and the faithful Laicks? But here yielding your Laick Elders of divine Institution, and to have from G O D an Authority of Ruling, as well as the Ministers have, then why do they not all come to Presbyteries? And why but one deputed from them? Was not this an Encroachment on them? For if they have from CHRIST a power to Rule, as well as Ministers, why should not all the Elders meet in Presbyteries and Synods, as well as Ministers? And why but one Elder from every Pres-

Presbytery, when three Ministers go to the National Synod? For it is folly to say, because Ministers have a power of teaching, therefore in Presbyteries and Synods the Elders must only equal their number, and in National Synods be near half their number: for that will only say that in matters of doctrine the Elders should be quite silent, but in matters of discipline, why all should not come if any have a right from Christ, will not be proved. And is not this to *Lord it over your Brethren*? And do not your Ministers thus tyrannize over their Elders? But the reason of it was visible, lest the Elders had thereby got the power in their hands, had they been the plurality in the Judicatories: which was well enough foreseen and guarded against by your Clergy, who though they were willing to serve themselves of them for a while, yet had no mind to part with their beloved Authority. But for Synods, if the obligation to them be from the unity of the Body, then nothing under an Oecumenical one will answer this, which yet is simply unpracticable. Now as for your National Synods, it is visible they are and must be framed, according to the divisions of the World in the several Kingdoms: for according to the Rules are pretended from Scripture (*tell the Church, the binding and loosing of sins, or the like*) it follows that Parochial Congregations, and the Pastors
in

in them, are vested with an authoritative power: now why they should be made to resign this to the plurality of the Church-men of that Kingdom, will be a great Atchievement to prove in your Principles. For why shall not a Parochial Church make Laws within it self? And why must it renounce its priviledg to such a number of Church-men cast in such a Classis by a humane power? As likewise, where find you a divine Warrant for your delegating Commissioners to Synods? For either they are Plenipotentiaries, or such as go upon a restricted deputation, but so as their Votes beyond their Commission shall signifie nothing, till they return and be approved by those who sent them; if they go with a full power, assign a Warrant for such a delegation, or that many Church-men may commiffionate one in their name, and that what shall be agreed to by the major part of these delegates, shall be a binding obligation on Christians: and yet I know you will think the *Independents* carry the Cause, if it be said that the appointments of these superiour Courts have no authority till ratified by the inferiour, which will resolve the Power into the inferiour Courts. By all which I think it is clear abundantly, that the associations of Churches into Synods, cannot be by a divine Warrant. But I must call in some relief, for I grow weary of speaking too long.

End.

End. I suppose none will deny the association of Churches to be an excellent mean for preserving unity and peace: but to assert a divine original for them, methinks, is a hard task; and truly to assert the divine Authority of the major part which must be done according to the principles of Presbytery, is a thing fuller of Tyranny over Consciences, than any thing can be feared from Episcopacy; since the greater part of mankind being evil, which holds true of no sort of people more, than of Church-men, what mischief may be expected if the plurality must decide all matters; And to speak plainly, I look on a potion of Physick as the best cure for him, who can think a National Synod, according to the model of *Glasgow*, is the Kingdom of *Christ* on Earth, or that Court to which he hath committed his Authority, for he seems beyond the power or conviction of Reason.

Crit. The Scripture clearly holds forth an authority among Church-men, but visibly restricted to their Commission, which truly is not properly a power residing among them, for they only declare what the Rule of the Gospel is; wherein if they keep close to it, they are only Publishers of the Laws of *CHRIST*: and if they err from it, they are not to be regarded: It is true, the administration of Sacraments is appropriated to them, yet he that will argue

M

this

this to have proceeded more from the general rules of Order, the constant practice of the Church, and the fitness of the thing, which is truly suitable to the dictates of Nature, and the Laws of Nations; than from an expresse positive Command, needs much Logick to make good his attempt. It is true, the ordaining of Successors in their Office belongs undoubtedly to them, and in trying them, Rules are expressly given out in Scripture, to which they ought to adhere and follow them: but as for other things, they are either decisions of opinions, or rules for practice. In the former their authority is purely to declare, and in that they act but as Men, and we find whole Schools of them have been abused; and in the other, they only give advices and directions, but have no Jurisdiction. It is true, much noise is made about the Council of *Jerusalem*, p. 106, as if that were a warrant for Synods to meet together. But first, it is clear no command is there given, so at most that will prove Synods to be lawful, but that gives them no authority, except you produce a clear Command for them, and obedience to them. Next, what strange wresting of Scripture is it, from that place to prove the subordination of Church Judicatories? for if that Council was not an OEcumenical Council, nor a Provincial one, which must be yielded, since we see
nothing

nothing like a Convocation ; then either *Paul* and *Barnabas* were sent from *Antioch*, as from one sister Church to ask advice of another; and if so, it proves nothing for the authority of Synods, since advices are not Laws: or *Antioch* sent to *Jerusalem*, as to a Superior Church by its constitution, which cannot be imagined : for what authority could the Church of *Jerusalem* pretend over *Antioch* ? And indeed had that been true, some vestige of it had remained in History; which is so far to the contrary, that the Church of *Jerusalem* was subordinate to the Church of *Cesarea*, which was Metropolitan in *Palestine*, was subject to *Antioch*, the third Patriarchal See. It will therefore remain that this was only a reference to the other Apostles, who besides their extraordinary endowments and inspiration, were acknowledged by all to be men of great eminency and authority : and therefore the authority of *Paul* and *Barnabas* not being at that time so universally acknowledged, they were sent to *Jerusalem*, where *S. James* was resident, and *S. Peter* occasionally present. Now the Authority of the Decree must be drawn from their infallible spirit ; otherwise it will prove too much, that one Church may give out decrees to another. But will the Apostles mutual consulting or conferring together, prove the National constitution, and authority of Synods or Assemblies ?

Poly. All that hath been said illustrates clearly the practice of the *Jews*, among whom as the High-Priest was possessed with a Prophetical Spirit, which sometimes fell on him by illapses, as appears from what is said of *Caiaphas*; and sometimes from the shining of the Stones in the Pectoral, called the *Urim* and *Thummim*; so the *Priests and Levites* being the chief Trustees and Depositories of the Law, *Their lips were to preserve knowledg, and the Law was to be sought at their mouth*, yet they had no Legislative Authority: they had indeed a Court among themselves, called the *Parhedrim*, made up of the heads of the Orders, and of the Families; but that Court did not pretend to Jurisdiction, but only to explain things that concerned the Temple-worship: nay, the High-Priest was so restricted to the *King and Sanhedrim*, that he might not consult the Oracle without he had been ordered to do it by them: neither do we ever hear of any Laws given out, all the *Old Testament* over, in the name of the Priests: And in the *New Testament*, the Power (it seems) was to be managed by the body of the faithful, as well as by Church-men. It is true, the Apostles were clothed with an extraordinary power of *binding and loosing of sins*; but no proofs are brought to justify the pretences to Jurisdiction that are found among their Successors. For in the *Epistle*
to

to *Corinth*, the Rules there laid down, are addressed to *all the Saints that were called to be faithful*: so also is the *Epistle to the Thessalonians*, where he tells them to *note such as walked disorderly, and have no fellowship with them*; which are shrewd grounds to believe that at first all things were managed Parochially, where the faithful were also admitted to determine about what occurred: but for Synods, we find not the least vestige of them before the end of the second Century, that Synods were gathered about the Controversie concerning the day of *Easter*; and the following Associations of Churches, shew clearly, that they took their model from the division of the *Roman Empire*, and so according as the Provinces were divided, the Churches in them did associate to the Metropolitans, and became subordinate to them, and these were subordinate to the Patriarchs; by which means it was that the Bishops of *Rome* had the precedence, not from any imaginary derivation from *St. Peter*: for had they gone on such Rules, *Jerusalem* where our Lord himself was, had undoubtedly carried it of all the World: but *Rome* being the *Imperial City*, it was the See of the greatest Authority. And no sooner did *Bizantium* creep into the dignity of being the *Imperial City*, but the Bishop of *Constantinople* was made second Patriarch, and in all things equal to the Bishop of

Rome, the precedency only excepted. Much might be here said for proving that these Synods did not pretend to a divine Original, though afterwards they claimed a high Authority, yet their appointments were never called Laws, but only Canons and Rules, which could not pretend to a Jurisdiction.

Basil. But that I may not seem to rob the Church of all her Power, I acknowledg that by the Laws of Nature it follows, that these who unite in the service of GOD, must be warranted to associate in Meetings to agree on generals Rules, and to use means for preserving purity and order among themselves, and that all Inferiours ought to subject themselves to their Rules. But as for that brave distinction of the Churches Authority, being derived from CHRIST as Mediator, whereas the Regal Authority is from him as GOD, well doth it become its inventors, and much good may it do them. For me, I think, that CHRIST's asserting, that *all power in heaven and in earth was given unto him*; and his being called, *The KING of Kings, and LORD of Lords*, make it as clear as the Sun, that the whole OEconomy of this World is committed to him as Mediator: and as they who died before him, were saved by him, who was *slain from the foundation of the world*: so all humane authority was given by vertue of the second Covenant,

Covenant, by which mankind was preserved from infallible ruin, which otherwise it had incurred by *Adams* fall. But leaving any further enquiry after such a foolish nicety, I go now to examine what the *Magistrates Power* is in matters of Religion: And first, I lay down for a Maxim, *That the externals of Worship, or Government, are not of such importance, as are the Rules of Justice and Peace, wherein formally the Image of GOD consists.* For CHRIST came to bring us to GOD: and the great end of his Gospel, is, the assimilation of us to GOD, of which, justice, righteousness, mercy and peace make a great part. Now what sacredness shall be in the outwards of Worship and Government, that these must not be medled with by his hands; and what unhallowedness is in the other, that they may fall within his Jurisdiction, my weakness cannot reach. As for instance, when the Magistrate allows *ten per cent* of interest, it is just to exact it; and when he brings it down to *six per cent*, it is oppression to demand *ten per cent*; so that he can determine some matters to be just or unjust by his Laws: now why he shall not have such a power about outward matters of Worship, or of the Government of the Church, judg you; since the one both in it self, and as it tends to commend us to God, is much more important than the other. It is

true, he cannot meddle with the holy things himself; for the Scripture rule is exprefs, that men be *separated for the work of the Ministry*: And without that separation, he invades the Altar of GOD, that *taketh that honor upon him, without he be called to it*. But as for giving Laws in the externals of Religion, I see not why he may not do it, as well as in matters Civil. It is true, if he contradict the divine Law by his commands, *G O D is to be obeyed rather than man*. But this holds in *things Civil*, as well as *Sacred*. For if he command murder, or theft, he is undoubtedly to be disobeyed, as well as when he commands amiss in matters of Religion. In a word, all Subjects are bound to obey him in every lawful command. Except therefore you prove that Church-men constituted in a Synod are not Subjects, they are bound to obedience, as well as others: Neither doth this Authority of the Magistrate any way prejudice the power *Christ* hath committed to his Church: For a Father hath power over his Children, and that by a *divine Precept*, tho the Supreme Authority have power over him, and them both: so the Churches authority is no way inconsistent with the Kings Supremacy. As for their *Declarative Power*, it is not at all subject to him, only the exercise of it, to this or that person, may be suspended: For since the Magistrate can banish
his

his Subjects, he may well silence them: Yet I acknowledg if he do this, out of a design to drive the Gospel out of his Dominions, they ought to continue in their duty, notwithstanding such prohibition; *for G O D. must be obeyed rather than man.* And this was the case of the *Primitive Bishops*, who rather than give over the feeding their Flocks, laid themselves open to Martyrdom. But this will not hold for warranting turbulent persons, who notwithstanding the Magistrates continuing all encouragements for the publick Worship of *G O D*, chuse rather than concur in it (tho not one of an hundred of them hath the confidence to call that unlawful) to gather separated Congregations, whereby the flocks are scattered.

Phil. Nay, since you are on that Subject, let me freely lay open the mischief of it: It is a direct breach of the Laws of the Gospel, that requires our solemn assembling together, which must ever bind all Christians, till there be somewhat in the very constitutions of these Assemblies, that renders our meeting in them unlawful: which few pretend in our case. Next, the Magistrates commanding these publick Assemblies, is certainly a clear and superadded obligation, which must bind all under sin, till they can prove these our Meetings for Worship unlawful. And as these separated Conventicles
are

are of their own nature evil, so their effects are yet worse, and such as indeed all the ignorance and profanity in the Land is to be charged on them: for as they dissolve the union of the Church, which must needs draw mischief after it, so the vulgar are taught to despise their Ministers, and the publick Worship, and thus get loose from the yolk. And their dependence on these separated Meetings, being but precarious, as they break away from the order of the Church, so they are not tied to their own order: and thus betwixt hands, the vulgar lose all sense of Piety, and of the Worship of GOD. Next, in these separated Meetings, nothing is to be had but a long preachment, so that the knowledg and manners of the people not being look'd after, and they taught to revolt from the settled *Discipline*, and to disdain to be catechised by their Pastors, *ignorance and profanity* must be the sure effect of these divided Meetings. And in fine, the disuse of the *LORD's Supper* is a guilt of a high nature; for the vulgar are taught to loath the Sacrament from their Ministers hands, as much as the Mass: and preaching is all they get in their Meetings: so that what in all Ages of the Church hath been looked on, as the great cherishing of Devotion and true Piety and the chief preserver of Peace among Christians, is wearing out of practice with our
new

new modelled Christians. These are the visible effects of separating practices : But I shall not play the uncharitable Diviner, to guess at the secret mischief such courses may be guilty of.

Basil. Truly, what you have laid out is so well known to us all, that I am confident *Isotimus* himself must with much sorrow acknowledg what wicked Arts these are that some use to dislocate the Body of Christ, and to sacrifice the interests of *Religion* to their vanity, humor, or perhaps their secular interests. But I hold on my design, and add, that if the Magistrate encroach on God's Prerogative, by *contradicting or abrogating divine Laws*, all he doth that way, falls on himself. But as for the Churches *Directive Power*, since the exercise of that is not of obligation, he may command a surcease in it. It is true, he may sin in so doing ; yet cases may be wherein he will do right to discharge all Associations of Judicatories, if a Church be in such commotion, that these Synods would but add to the flame : but certainly he forbidding such Synods, they are not to be gone about, there being no positive command for them in Scripture, and therefore a discharge of them contradicts no Law of God, and so cannot be disobeyed without sin : and when the Magistrate allows of Synods, he is to judg on whether side
in

in case of differences, he will pass his Law: neither is the decision of these Synods obligatory in prejudice of his authority; for there can be but one Supream; and two Coordinate Powers are a *Chymæra*. Therefore in case a Synod and the Magistrate contradict one another in matters undetermined by GOD, it is certain a Synod sins if it offer to countermand the *Civil Authority*, since all must be subject to the Powers that are, of which number the Synod is a part; therefore they are subject as well as others. And if they be bound to obey the Magistrates commands, they cannot have a power to warrant the subjects in their disobedience, since they cannot secure themselves from sin by such disobedience. And in the case of such countermands, it is indisputable the Subjects are to be determined by the Magistrates Laws, by which only the Rules of Synods are Laws, or bind the consciences formally; since without they be authorized by him, they cannot be Laws; for we cannot serve two Masters, nor be subject to two Legislators. And thus, methinks, enough is said for clearing the Title of the *Magistrate in exacting our obedience to his Laws in matters of Religion*.

Crit. Indeed, the congesting of all the *Old Testament* offers, for proving the Civil Powers their authority in things sacred, were a task of
time:

ime: And first of all, that the High Priest might not consult the Oracle, but when either desired by the King, or in a business that concerned the whole Congregation, is a great step to prove what the Civil Authority was in those matters. Next, we find the Kings of *Judah* give out many Laws about matters of Religion: I shall wave the instances of *David* and *Solomon*, which are so express, that no evasion can serve the turn, but to say they acted by immediate Commission, and were inspired of GOD. It is indeed true, that they had a particular direction from GOD. But it is as clear, that they enacted these Laws upon their own Authority, as Kings, and not on a Prophetical Power.

But we find *Jehoshaphat*, 2 *Chr.* 17. v. 7. sending to his Princes to teach in the Cities of *Judah*, with whom also he sent *Priests* and *Levites*, and they went about and taught the people. There you see secular men appointed by the King to teach the people: he also, 2. *Chr.* 19. v. 5. set up in *Jerusalem* a Court made up of *Levites*, *Priests*, and the chief of the Fathers of *Israel*, for the judgment of the LORD, and for the controversies among the people; and names two Presidents, *Amariah* the chief Priest to be over them in the matters of the LORD, and *Zebadiah* for all the Kings matters. And he that
will

will consider these words, either as they lie in themselves, or as they relate to the first institution of that Court of seventy by *Moses*, where no mention is made but by one Judicatory, or to the Commentary of the whole Writings, and Histories of the *Jews*, shall be set beyond dispute, that here was but one Court to judge both of sacred and secular matters. It is true, the *Priests* had a Court already mentioned, but it was no Judicatory, and medled only with the Rituals of the Temple. The *Levites* had also, as the other Tribes, a Court of twenty three for their Tribe, which have occasioned the mistakes of some places among the *Jewish* Writings: but this is so clear from their Writings, that a very overly knowledg of them will satisfy an impartial Observer. And it is yet more certain, that from the time of *Ezra*, to the destruction of the Temple, there was but one Court, that determined of all matters both Sacred and Civil; who particularly tried the *Priests*, if free of the blemishes which might cast one from the service, and could cognosce on the High Priest, and whip him when he failed in his duty. Now this commixtion of these matters in one Judicatory, if it had been so criminal, whence is it that our *L O R D* not only never reprov'd so great a disorder, but when convened before them, did not accuse

cuse their constitution, and answered to the High Priest when adjured by him? Likewise, when his Apostles were arraigned before them, they never declined that Judicatory, but pleaded their own innocence, without accusing the constitution of the Court, though challenged upon a matter of doctrine. But they, *good men*, thought only of catching Souls into the Net of the Gospel, and were utterly unacquainted with these new coined distinctions. Neither did they refuse obedience, pretending the Court had no Jurisdiction in these matters, but because it was better to obey GOD than Man; which saith, They judged Obedience to that Court due, if it had not countermanded GOD.

But to return to *Jehoshaphat*, we find him constituting these Courts, and choosing the persons and empowering them for their work, *for he constituted them for Judgment and for Controversie*; so that though it were yielded, as it will never be proved, that two Courts were here instituted, yet it cannot be denied, but here is a Church Judicatory constituted by a King, the persons named by him, a President appointed over them, and a trust committed to them. And very little Logick will serve to draw from this, as much as the Acts among us, asserting the King's Supremacy yield to him.

Next,

Next, We have a clear instance of *Hezekiah*, who, *2 Chron. 30. ver. 2.* with the *Counsel of his Princes, and of the whole Congregation*, made a decree for keeping the *Passover*, that year on the *second Month*, whereas the Law of *G O D* had affixed it to the *first Month*, leaving only an exception, *Numb. 9. 10. for the unclean, or such as were on a journey*, to keep it on the second Month. Npon which *Hezekiah* with the *Sanhedrim* and people, appoints the *Passover* to be entirely cast over to the second Month for that Year. Where a very great point of their Worship (for the distinction of days was no small matter to the *Jews*) was determined by the King, without asking the advice of the Priests upon it. But that you may not think this was peculiar to the King of *Israel*, I shall urge you with other instances: When *Ezra* came from *Artaxerxes*, he brings a Commission from him, *Ezra ch. 7. ver. 25, 26.* empowering him according to the wisdom of his *G O D*, that was in his hand, to set up *Magistrates and Judges, who might judg them that knew the Laws of his G O D, and teach them that knew them not*: and a severe certificate is passed upon the disobedient; and one of the branches of their punishment, which is by the Translators rendered *banishment*, being in the *Chaldaick*, rooting out, is by some judged to be *Excommunication*; which is the more probable,

be-

because afterwards, *Chap. 10. ver. 8.* the Censure he threatens on these who came not upon his Proclamation, is, *forfeiture of goods, and separation from the Congregation.* Here then it seems a Heathen King gives authority to Excommunicate: but be in that what will, *Ezra* upon his return acted in a *high Character*, he makes the *Priests, Levites*, and all *Israel*, to swear to put away their strange Wives: he convenes all the people under the Certificate of separation from the Congregation, and enjoyns Confession of their sins and amendment: and we find both him and *Nehemiah* acting in a *high Character* about the ordering of divine matters, which could only flow from the King's 'Commission, for neither of them were Prophets, nor was *Ezra* the High Priest but his Brother, and so no more than an ordinary Priest. *Mordecai* likewise instituted the feast of *Purim*, for which nothing could warrant him, but the King's authority, committed to him, who gave him his Ring for sealing such Orders, since he was neither King, Priest nor Prophet. And on the way, let me observe what occurs from that History, for proving what was yesterday pleaded for, *The Subjects ought not to resist, no not the tyranny of their Superiours*, since a Writing was procured from *Abasuerus* for warranting the *Jews* to avenge themselves, and to stand for their lives,

N

and

and to destroy and slay all that would assault them, which saith they might not have done this before that writing was given out, and yet their killing of 74000 of their Enemies shews, what their strength was. But all I have said will prove that the Civil Powers under the Old Testament did formally judg about matters of Religion; and that that priviledg belongs to Kings by vertue of their Regal dignity, and not as they are in Covenant with GOD, since even Heathen Kings give out Orders about divine matters.

Poly. If from Sacred you descend to humane practices, nothing was more used than that the Emperors judged in matters of Religion, neither was this yielded to them only after they became Christians, but *Eusebius, lib. 7. cap. 30.* tells, how they made application to *Aurelian* a Heathen Emperor, for turning *Samosatenus* out of the Church of *Antioch*, who decreed that the Houses of the Church should be given to those Bishops, whom the Christians of *Italy* and the *Roman* Bishops should recommend to them. *Constantine* also, when not baptized, did all his life formally judg in matters both of Doctrine and Discipline: and for the Laws they made about Church matters, they abound so much, that, as *Grotius* saith, *One needs not read them, but look on them to be satisfied about this.*
And

And indeed I know not how to express my wonder at the affrontedness of that Pamphleter, who denies this, *pag.* 483. Pray ask him, was the determining about the age, the qualifications, the Election, the duties of Church-men, the declaring for what things they should be deposed, or excommunicated, a formal passing of Laws in Church matters, or only the adding Sanctions to the Church determinations? And yet who will but with his Eye run through either the first six *Titles* of the *Code*, or the 123. *Novel*, besides many other places, all these, and many more Laws about Church matters will meet him. But should I take a full Career here, I am sure I should be tedious, and *Grotius* hath congested so many instances of this, that I refer the curious Reader to him for full satisfaction. The Elections of Bishops which had been formerly in the hands of the people and Clergy, with the Provincial Synods that judged of them, became so tumultuary, that popular Elections were discharged by the Council of *Laodicea*, *Can.* 13. and the Emperors did either formally name, as *Theodosius* did *Nectarius*, or reserve the ratifying their Election to themselves. And I must confess, it is a pretty piece of History, to say the Bishops consented to this, either as dissident of their Office, or out of ambition. See *p.* 485. Tell your Friends that they must either

learn more knowledg, or pretend to less; for can they produce the least vestige for the one branch of this alternative, that the Bishops their allowing the Emperor such an interest in their Elections, flowed from a distrust of their Office? Let them give but one scrap of proof for this, and let them triumph as much as they will. Is it not a pretty thing to see one talk so superciliously of things he knows not?

Isot. But all you have brought will never prove that a King may at one stroke subvert a Government established in the Church, and turn out all who adhere to it, and set up another in its place; neither will this conclude that the King may enact all things about Ecclesiastical matters, and Persons, by his own bare authority, which is a surrender of our consciences to him: certainly, this is to put him in *CHRIST*'s stead, and what mischievous effects may follow upon this, if all matters of Religion be determined, by the pleasure of secular and carnal men, who consider their interests and appetites more than *God*'s glory, or the good of the Church and of Souls: Truly my heart trembles to think on the effects this both hath produced, and still may bring forth. *See pag. 483.*

Phil. It is charity to ease your Lungs sometimes by taking a turn in the Discourse, though you need none of my help. But what you say,

Isoti.

Isotimus, doth no way overturn what hath been asserted: for either the change that was made was necessary, sinful, or indifferent: the two former shall not be at this time debated, but shall be afterwards discussed: but if it be indifferent, then the Kings Laws do oblige us to obedience, and the mischief hath followed on the change falls to their share, who do not obey the King's Laws, when the matter of them is lawful. And as for the thrusting out Church-men when they are guilty, *Solomon's* precedent is convincing, who thrust out *Abiathar* from the High Priesthood; neither can the least hint be given to prove that he acted as inspired, and not as a King: and *Nebemiah* tho but commissioned by *Artaxerxes*, thrust one out from the Priesthood, for marrying a strange Woman.

For your prying into Acts of Parliament, truly neither you nor I need be so much conversant in them. Neither were it any strange matter, if some expressions in them would not bear a strict Examen. But that you now challenge about the *King's enacting of all matters*, will never infer a surrender of conscience to him; for certainly that must relate to what goeth before, of the *outward Government and Policy of the Church*. Besides, none will quarrel the phrase of the *Kings authority* in all things that are *Civil*; yet that will not infer that he can enact the lawfulness of

murther and theft. So these expressions must carry with them *a tacite exception*. Yea, even without that allowance, the phrase may be well justified, since it only imports that the Kings enacting any thing in these matters, makes them legal, which differs much from lawful; and saith only that such Orders issued forth by the King, are *de facto* Laws, which will not conclude they must be obeyed; but only that his authority is to be acknowledged, either by obedience, if the command be just, or by suffering, if unjust. As for the effects this may produce, I am sure they cannot prove worse than these which have followed upon the pretences of the Churches *absolute authority, and intrinsick Sovereign Power*. And indeed since there is so much corruption among men, nothing that falls into the hands of men, can scape the mixtures of abuse at long run. But I must add, that the passions and pride of many Church-men in all Ages have been such, that the decision of the plurality of Church-men, seems the model of the World that is fullest of danger.

Isot. Three things yet remain to be discussed: The one is, if obedience be due to the Laws, when they command things contrary to our consciences? For sure you cannot pretend in that case, to give a preference to humane Laws beyond conscience, which is the voice of
GOD,

GOD. The next is, when the Magistrate commands things just of themselves, but upon unjust motives and narratives, whether my obedience doth not homologate his bad designs? And finally, where the commands of the Magistrate are manifestly unlawful, how far should the Church, and Church men, oppose and contradict them? For a bare non-obedience seems not to be all we are bound to, in that case. When I am satisfied in these things, I will quit this purpose.

Basil. To engage in a particular discussion of what is now moved by you, would draw on more discourse than our present leisure will allow of; yet I shall attempt the saying of what may satisfy a clear and unprejudged mind. And to the first, I shall not fall on any longer enquiry into the nature and obligation of conscience, than to tell that *conscience is a conviction of our rational faculties, that such or such things are futable to the nature and Will of God.* Now all Religion is bound upon us, on this account, that there is such evidence offered for its truth, which may and ought to satisfy the strictest Examen of Reason. And all certainty is resolved in this, that our rational faculties are convinced of the truth of the objects that lie before us: which conviction when applied to divine matters, is called *Conscience*. But there may be

great mistakes in this Conviction: for either the prejudices that lie on our minds from our senses, the prepossessions of Education, interest, or humors, the want of a due application of our faculties to their objects, or chiefly the dulness and lesion of our Organs, the corruption of our minds through sin and lust, occasion many errors: so that often without good reason, oft contrary to it, we take up persuasions, to which we stilly adhere, and count such convictions evidences of the Will of *G O D*. I acknowledg, when a Man lies under a persuasion of the Will of *G O D*, he ought not to go cross to it: for this opens a door to Atheism, when that is contradicted of which we are convinced. But if this persuasion be false, it cannot secure a Man from sinning in following of it. For it is a Man's own fault that he is thus imposed upon, since if his rational faculties were duly applied, and well purified, they should prove unerring touchstones of truth. If therefore through vanity, wilfulness, rashness, or any other byass of the mind, it be carried to wrong measures, a Man is to blame himself, and thus his error ought to aggravate, and not lessen his guilt. If then a Man's conscience dictate to him the contrary of what *G O D* commands, in that case, he is in a visible hazard: for his error can never take away *G O D*'s Authority, and so his wrong
infor-

informed conscience doth not secure him from guilt, if he be disobedient. On the other hand, nothing in Scripture can bind a Man to act against the convictions of conscience, since we are bound to believe the Scriptures, only because of the evidence of their authority to our rational faculties: If then our belief of the Scriptures rest on that foundation, no part of Scripture can bind us to walk contrary to that evidence, for then it should destroy that Principle on which our Obligation to believe it self is founded, which is the evidence of reason; and so in that case, a Man sins whatever he do. Neither is this to be accountd strange, since that *erroneous conscience* is from man's own fault. And that which some alledg to escape this, that in such cases a Man ought to forbear from acting, will not serve turn, to excuse a Man from sin: For in these Precepts which exact a positive obedience, such a forbearance and surceasing from action, is a sin.

Upon these Evidences then it will follow, that if the conviction of our conscience run contrary to the Magistrates commands, these *convictions* are either well grounded, or ill: If the former, then the Magistrates command being contrary to the nature and Will of G O D, are not to be obeyed: If ill grounded, then that mistaken persuasion cannot secure us from sin,

no

no more than *in the case of conscience* contradicting the Law of GOD: for the Laws of the Magistrates in things lawful, are the Laws of GOD, being the application of his general Laws unto particular instances, by one cloathed with authority from him. Therefore tho I do not say the Laws of the Magistrate can warrant our counteracting an *erroneous conscience*; yet on the contrary, a *misinformed conscience* will not secure us when we disobey the Magistrates lawful commands. And thus I think your first Question is clearly answered.

End. You have a great deal of reason to say so, your discourse being so closely rational, that I cannot see any escape from any part of it; yet I must add, that certainly it is a piece of *Christian tenderness*, which obligeth all in Authority, to beware of laying gall-traps and snares in the way of *tender consciences*. And the best way to get an *undisputed obedience*, is, that their commands be liable to as few exceptions as is possible; and that the good of any such Laws be well ballanced with the hazards of them, that so the Communion of the Church in all outwards, particularly in the Sacraments, may be had on as easie terms as is possible, whereby nothing be enacted that may frighten away weaker minds from *the fellowship of the Saints*. But on the other hand, great caution must be had by all Subjects
on

on what grounds they refuse *obedience to the Laws*, that so they be not found following their own designs and interests, under a colour of adhering firmly to *their consciences*. They must deliver themselves from all prepossessions, and narrowly examine all things, ere they adventure on refusing *obedience to the Laws*. But now consider if an unjust motive or narrative in a Law, deliver *tender consciences* from an obligation to obey it, or not?

Basil. If the Magistrate do couple his motive and narrative with our obedience, so that we cannot do the one without a seeming consent to the other, then certainly we are not to obey: For actions being often signs of the thoughts, an action how indifferent soever, if declared a sign of concurring in a sinful design, makes us guilty, in so far as we express our concurrence by a sign enjoined for that end. But if the motive or narrative be simply an account of the Magistrates own thoughts, without expressing that *obedience* is to be understood as a *concurrence* in such intentions, then we are to obey a lawful command, tho enacted upon a bad design: For we must obey these in Authority, ever till they stand in competition with GOD. If then their Laws contradict not GOD's Precepts, neither in their natural nor intended signification, they are to be obeyed, whatever the grounds

grounds were for enacting them, which is only the Magistrates deed, for which he shall answer to G O D.

Poly. This calls me to mind of two Stories not impertinent to this purpose : The one is of *Julian the Apostate*, who to entangle the Christians, that never scrupled the bowing to the Emperors Statue, as a thing lawful, caused to set up his with the Images of some of the Gods about it, that such as bowed to it, might be understood, as (likewise) bowing to the Images : which abused some of the simpler : but the more discerning refused to bow at all to those Statues, because he intended to expound that innocent bowing to his Statue, as an adoration of the Gods about it. A Christian likewise being brought to the King of *Persia*, did according to the Law bow before him ; but when he understood that to be exacted as a divine Honor to the King, he refused it.

Eud. This is clear enough that all actions are as they are understood, and accordingly to be performed, or surceased from. But it seems more difficult to determine what is to be done in case a Magistrate enact wicked Laws : Are not both his Subjects bound to refuse obedience ; and the Heads of the Church, and the watchmen of Souls likewise to witness against it ? And may they not declare openly their dislike of such
Laws

Laws or practices, and proceed against him with the censures of the Church? since as to the Censures of the Church, we see no reason why they should be dispensed with *respect of persons*, which S. James condemns in all Church Judicatories.

Basil. I shall not need to repeat what hath been so often said, that *we must obey GOD rather than man*: if then the Magistrates enjoyn what is directly contrary to the *divine Law*, all are to refuse obedience, and watchmen ought to warn their Flocks against such hazards; and such as can have admittance to their Princes, or who have the charge of their Consciences, ought with a great deal of sincere freedom, as well as humble duty, represent the evil and sinfulness of such Laws: but for any *Synodical Convention*, or any Declaration against them, no warrant for that doth appear; and therefore if the Magistrate shall simply discharge all Synods, I cannot see how they can meet without sin. But for Parochial meetings of Christians for a solemn acknowledgment of GOD, such Assemblings for divine Worship, being enjoined both by the Laws of Nature, and Nations, and particularly commanded in the Gospel, no consideration can free Christians from their Obligation, thus to assemble for Worship: if then the Magistrate should discharge these or any part of them, such as Prayer, Praises, and reading of Scrip-

Scriptures, preaching the Gospel, or the use of the Sacraments, they are notwithstanding all that to be continued in. But for the consultative or directive Government of the Church, till a divine Command be produced for Synods or Discipline, it cannot lawfully be gone about without or against his authority.

Crit. For refusing obedience to an unjust command, of surceasing visible Worship, the instance of *Daniel* is signal: who not only continued his adorations to *G O D*, for all *Darius* his Law; but did it openly; and avowedly, that so he might own his subjection to *G O D*. But for reproving Kings, we see what caution was to be observed in it; since *G O D* sent Prophets with express Commissions for it in the Old Testament: and *Samuel* notwithstanding this severe message to *Saul*, yet honored him before his people. It is true, there should be no respect of persons in Christian Judicatories: but that is only to be understood of these who are subject to them: and how it can agree to the King who is Supream, to be a Subject, is not easily to be comprehended. Since then honor and obedience is by divine precept due to Magistrates, nothing that invades that honor, or detracts from that obedience, can be lawfully attempted against them: such as is any Church-censure or excommunication. And therefore I
can-

cannot see how that practice of *Ambrose* upon *Theodosius*, or other later instances of some Bishops of Rome, can be reconciled to that, *Render fear to whom fear, and honor to whom honor is due.*

Phil. I am sure their practice is far less justifiable, who are always preaching about the Laws and times to the people, with virulent reflections on King, Parliament and Council: much more such as not content with flying discourses, do by their writings, which they hope shall be longer lived, study the vilifying the persons, and affronting the authority of these GOD hath set over them. And how much of this stuff the Press hath vented these thirty years by past, such as knew the late times, or see their writings, can best judge.

Eud. Now our discourse having dwelt so long upon generals, is to descend to particulars: That we may examine whether upon the grounds hitherto laid down, the late tumults, or the present Schisms and divisions can be justified, or ought to be censured? I know this is a nice point, and it is to be tenderly handled, lest all that shall be said be imputed to the suggestions of passions and malice. Wherefore let me intreat you who are to bear the greater part of that discourse, to proceed in it calmly, that it may appear your designs are not to lodge infamy on any party or person, but simply to lay

lay out things as they are: hoping withal, that you will not take your informations of what you say from the tales of persons concerned, but will proceed on true and sure grounds. And that we may return to this with the greater composedness of spirit; let our serious thoughts be interrupted with some chearfuller diversions: for our spirits are now too far engaged to fall upon such a Head.

Isot. You have a great deal of reason to guard your Friends well when they are to fall upon such matters, lest they sin against the generation of GOD's Children. For my part, I am not afraid to enter on a discussion of these things, and doubt not to make it appear how the LORD's work was signally carried on by his faithful Servants, and that he himself appeared in it, even to the conviction of all beholders. If there were any either of the Church or State, who covered their own bad designs, under these pretences, that makes not the cause a whit the worse: for CHRIST chose twelve, and one of them had a Devil.

Phil. Were I at present to fall a canvassing these things, I doubt not I should quickly make all your Plumes fall off: but I am willing at this time to break off our Conference: for this point will neither be soon dispatched nor easily managed; therefore we shall now part with an appointed-

pointment to meet next day in this same place after Dinner.

Basil. I believe none of us are so weary of another, or of the Discourses we have tossed these two days, that it is needful to apprehend any will fail of being here at that hour: therefore, good night to you all.

Iſot. Be sure, I shall keep it, if an unavoidable excuse detain me not. Adieu.

Crit. For me and *Polyhistor*, though it is like we shall not have great occasion of bearing our share in your Discourse, yet we will not fail to be here.

Eud. I cannot express my sense of the Honour you do me, in making this place still happy with so many good Company, and so much pleasant Discourse: and therefore you may assure your selves, I will wait for your return, not without impatience. And so I bid you all, good night.

O

THE

THE THIRD CONFERENCE.

Isotimus.

WE are again as good as our word in keeping this appointment, and I hope we shall be no less exact in observing the Rule we concluded last night of tempering our passions; only I must guard you against the mistaking my zeal I may express for passion: remember who said, *The zeal of thy house hath eaten me up, who also scourged the buyers and sellers out of the Temple.*

Eud. I confess, I want not my fears of some heat and excess in this days Discourse: but I will crave leave to check it on what side soever it appear, I know there is a holy zeal for GOD, which will inflame a devout mind. But its fire is mild and gentle, free of blustering and disorder: and that rage which is in many, for some Parties or Opinions, and against others, being
as

as void of knowledg as of Charity, ought not to pretend to Christ's Example, unless they be likewise acted by his Spirit. A diligent search will quickly discover, if our motives and maxims have a tincture of his lowly meek and self-denying spirit in them. And certainly if our zeal be for GOD, it will take its degrees from the proportion of its Objects. It is therefore a *Pharisaical* pretence to own a zeal for some smaller matters, which have scarce been thought upon by the whole series of Christians in all Ages, till of late, when we are so cold in the defence of Peace, Charity, obedience to those over us, and the Unity of the Church : which are great, certain, and indispenfible Duties. That zeal likewise which transports a man unto unjustifiable heats of railing against particular persons, and appears in a bitter humor of dull jeering, and bold detraction, hath no reason to shroud it self under the Example of *CHRIST's* holy zeal ; who tho in the spirit of a Zealot, having proved his divine Mission and authority by Miracles, he whipped the defilers of the Temple out of it ; yet that dispensation wherein such practices were not unusual from extraordinary persons, being now changed into the new one, whose distinguishing Character is *Charity*, we are to bridle all the motions of distempered heat, lest the effects

of it be as unjustifiable as it self is. For it is to be considered, that the proper characters of the Gospel Spirit, are not devotion towards GOD, or zeal for his truths, which were common both with the Religion traditionally conveyed from *Adam*, and *Noah*, and that which was delivered to *Moses*; but that which *CHRIST* hath made the cognisance of his Disciples, is, *That they love one another*, whereby all must know them to be such. And therefore all these who discover a spirit of hatred, rage, and malice at these, of whom they cannot deny but they may be *Christ's* Disciples, prove themselves to be void of his Spirit. Now, *Isotimus*, what endless complaints could I here make of some you know of, who are perpetually trafficking to make all who differ from them odious, who catch up every Tattle they hear that may defame them, and are sure to spread it as far as either their Tongue or Pen can reach: nor are they Niggards of their additions to them, to make them swell bigger. With what marvellous joy do they suck in an ill report? and tho it be but dubiously related, they will be sure to vent it as the greatest truth in the World. And when the stock of Reports fails them, then they break in upon their Magazins of Forgeries: and here is an endless Trade. Sometimes they will piece up things as incoherent as the Rags
of

of a Beggars Cloak, and shew either their pretended *intelligence*, or profound *sagacity*, to smell out bad *intentions*. If they can fix nothing on their *Adversary*, then that he is an *Hypocrite*, or a *Dissembler*, comes well to serve all purposes, and to defeat the best *intentions*: And, oh! but the jealousies of Popery and Jesuitical practices, work wonders on their Belief! Indeed, Sir, I must tell you freely, I see a Spirit stirring among us, which I look upon as tinctured with the deepest dye of *Antichristianism*, and so void of the common impressions of good nature and civility; but much more of his Image, who will have us *learn of him, in that he is meek and lowly*, that really a Man had as well live among *Scythians* and *Barbarians*, as among such Wasps and Vipers. Every thing is alike for their malice. Do some that differ from them live in a franker way, these are sure to be called *licentious and profane*. Are others more severe, silent, and retired, who express a contempt of the world with all its enjoyments, these must pass for Papists, Juglers and Hypocrites; and their best actions must be lashed with the worst Censures. Again, if we treat them softly with gentleness and respect, then they are insolent, and impute such usage to our distrust of our own Opinions, and a forced value of their way. And if we use a little more free-

dom to speak home, and discover their weakness and perverseness to them, then they rage and foam, and call us *Blasphemers*; and apply all the threatnings against mockers of *G O D* and Piety, to such as shall offer to unmask them, or disclose any of their follies. If these in Authority coerce them, nothing is to be heard but complaints of *persecution, and revilings, and evil surmisings*: But will gentle courses mollifie their hearts? No, not so much as to be grateful or civil to those to whom they ow them: but they will be sure to observe how *G O D* binds up the hands of the wicked, and how marvellously he protects his own: and all the favor shewed them will have no better character than a *very mean and scant act of Justice, elicite by a visible State conveniency, if not necessity*. See p. 493. You know of whom I mean, and how justly applicable these Characters are to them: and that they are not the dreams of an *extravagant fancy*; but true, though imperfect descriptions of what every one sees to be among us.

Isot. I am heartily sorry to find you the first that swerves from your own Rule, and to hear you engage in a Discourse so unlike your self, at least so different from the character is conceived of you: these invectives being fitter for the *Author of the friendly Debate, the Scribler of the Dialogues, or the Asserter of Ecclesiastical Policy*, who
have

have mortally wounded *Religion*, and all the professions and expressions of it, under a pretence of unvailing the *Pharisaical spirit*. And indeed you are now in the same Tract, your design being to charge all the faithful servants of *CHRIST*, with this tatling, whispering, and censorious temper; because perhaps some idle people who own a kindness for these Opinions, but really are of no principles, may be guilty of these ways.

Eud. I beseech you, wrest not my words beyond my design, and their meaning. I charge not the whole Party with these Arts: yet that there is too great compliance given to them, and too little freedom used against them, by too many, may without injustice, or breach of Charity, be averred: but the disclosing of these is so far from *injuring Religion*, that I know nothing so proper for recovering the World from the jealousies these Arts have occasioned at it, as the unmasking of that Spirit; that so the amiable and lovely visage of *true Religion* may appear in its own lustre, and free of these false Colors some unjust pretenders to it, have cast over it: and therefore these Writings you mention, seem to have pursued a noble Design, which shall not want its reward. But remember I make a vast difference betwixt the being of an Opinion, and the pursuing all these crooked and wicked

practices for its defence, which I have laid before you. At the former, I have no quarrel : for knowing how subject my self is to mistakes, I censure and judg none for their Opinions, till they strike at the *foundations of Faith*, or a *good life* : And so do not only not charge all your Party with these imputations, but know a great many of them who are very free of them : but that many are too guilty of them, is what your self dares not deny. And how much of that temper appears in the late Pamphlets, I leave with every rational *Reader* to consider : for it is not worth the while for any of us to sit down, and canvass them all. But how guilty are most of you in this which you here blame me unjustly for, which is the charging a Party with the escapes, how great or signal soever, of some individuals. For to undertake the Patrocinny of every man in every Party, is that which none in his right wits will do : To deal therefore equally with you, I neither think your Party nor ours, culpable for the faults of some particular persons. But, *Sir*, when a perverse detracting Spirit gets in to these who pretend highly, certainly they ought to be told it, and that roundly too. For you know the greatest danger to *Religion*, is to be apprehended from *the leaven of the Scribes and Pharisees* ; since open and discernible faults do not so much prevail for infecting the *Christian Societies*,

as these secret and more easily palliated errors. Consider therefore a little what was the righteousness of the *Pharisees*, and what was their leaven, and search for it; lest it yet leaven you, and lest your righteousness exceed not theirs. The *Pharisees* prayed often, and long, both in the Synagogues, streets, and widows houses: they studied the Law exactly, and had a great reverence for *Moses* and the *Prophets*, and much zeal against *blasphemers*, *false teachers* and *hereticks*: They were strict observers of the *Sabbath*, and were careful to prepare for their *Pass-over solemnities*: They had great respect for the opinions of their *Ancestors*: They looked grave and solemn: They fasted often, and gave tythes of all they had: Their outward deportment was not only clean, but beautiful: They were zealous to gain *Profelytes*, and expressed a tenderness of conscience, even in the smallest matters: They were careful to avoid all converse with profane or wicked persons. In a word, they had many things, which to a vulgar and less discerning eye, made a fair show in the flesh. But with all this, they were proud, and exalted in their own conceits, so that they despised all other persons: They were Magisterial, and desired to prescribe to every body: They were full of empty boasting, and assumed to themselves big and swelling Titles: and all their opinions they obtruded

as Oracles. *They did all to be seen of men, and loved salutations in the market places, and the uppermost rooms at feasts.* They envied any they saw outstrip them in true worth; and hated and contemned all that followed these. They studied to calumniate and revile every person that opposed them, with the most unjust and cruel reproaches, excommunicating all who adhered to them: Neither would they yield to the clearest evidences were offered for their conviction: and nothing but the blood of the most innocent could satisfy their revenge. They were covetous, and *devoured widows houses*, with their pretences of devotion. They were false and subdalous, studying to ensnare others in their speeches, or wrest what they said to a contrary and mischievous sense. They were traytors to these in Authority, though when it might serve their ends, they spared not to pretend much zeal for them: and the fervor of their zeal made them often attempt the murdering of those who opposed them, and discovered their false pretexs, and mischievous designs. And from this, let all Judge how much of that *Pharisaical leaven* doth yet lurk, and leaven among us. I know the application would be thought as invidious, as it is obvious. And, I pray G O D, those guilty of these evils, may charge them home upon themselves: For I confess, I love not that

part

part of the *Chirurgeons trade* so well, as to dwell longer on the cutting of ulcers, or the searching of sores: and these whom this general hint will not help to some conviction, would be little prevailed upon by a closer discovery of the parallel. But mistake me not, as if I charged one party only with this leaven, which is, alas! too visible among many of all sides and parties. But to dwell no longer on generals, which every one will drive off himself, and lodge on others, let us now come to a closer review of our late times. And here, *Philarcheus*, I quit the Theme to you, who I know can manage it better.

Phil. Truly, when I reflect on the late times, and the spirit which did then act in the Judicatories both of Church and State, I wonder much how any can be guilty of the error of thinking it was the cause of GOD was then fought for. I deny not but a great many, yea, I am willing to hope the greater part, were misled and abused, and did imagine it was *Religion and Liberties* they fought for; and so went out as they were called, in the simplicity of their heart, and knew not any thing of the secret designs of their Leaders: As in the case of *Absolems* rebellion, two hundred went from *Jerusalem* with him, which might well a little excuse their fault, but could not alleviate the guilt of that unnatural rebellion: so whatever may be said for excusing the multi-

multitudes, who, I doubt not, meant well, yet that will never serve for vindicating the course was followed. I confess, if I saw any remorse or shame for by-past miscarriages; if I found these people we speak of, either humbled for them before **G O D**, or ashamed of them among men, I should be the last on earth who would upbraid them with them: and that the rather, that *His Majesty* hath buried the remembrance of them by a gracious oblivion. But when they continue so insolent, as still to bear up so high in their pretensions, as if **G O D** had been visibly with them: and when they think it an injury to their innocency to tell them of an indemnity, who would not be tempted to take them to task, and examine all their vain boastings, and empty pretences? to which I am both provoked from their arrogance, and invited from the evident proofs of all I shall alledge, which I can lay before you from authentic Papers and Registers: and I shall freely tell you, that if any of these Pamphleteers had but the half to say of these who yield a compliance to the present Establishment, which I can say of them, the world would ring with it. But I count the defaming of men a work as mean, as it is cruel. Yet I look upon my self as obliged to give some accounts of the spirit and ways of these people, which I shall do with all the
reserve

reserve and caution that becomes a Christian.

Eud. Hold, hold, I pray you, run not too far in your carrear, lest you lay open things were better hid: I confess these Writers do justly draw it from you; but for the faults of two or three, be not cruel to a multitude. And what will all you shall say avail? for we know well enough how little the clearest evidence will prevail upon their belief: And though I in particular, know upon what grounds you can go, for verifying all you undertake, and that they are unexceptionably clear; yet it is a dunghil not to be searched too much. Wherefore let me, with my most earnest intreaties, divert you from the discourse you have threatned *Isotimus* with. But because all these mens defences of the resistance Subjects may make to their Sovereigns, go upon the principles of maintaining Religion and Liberties, when invaded by the Magistrate; we will therefore be beholden to you, if you satisfy us, whether the late wars, as they were begun and carried on, were defensive or not?

Phil. Your authority over me is so entire, that your commands never fail of determining my obedience, therefore for this once I shall yield to your desire, but with this declaration, that if *Isotimus* cannot prevail among his friends, for conjuring that pamphleting spirit
into

into silence, I will be forced on more freedom than I either design or desire: and be made to tell name and surname of the Actors of many things, which they may wish lay dead: and be made to prove them from authentick papers and records, and discover a mystery of iniquity, which hath lien long hid under fair pretences: and in a word, let you understand what were the arts, caballings, and intrigues of these who pretended so much to the interest of CHRIST, when they sought their own: and if in doing this, I be forced on much round and plain dealing, the blame of it will fall to their share who extort it from me. But I come now to satisfy your desire, and doubt not to convince you, that the late wars were an invasion of the Kings Authority, and of the established Laws, and were not for defence of any part of the established Religion and Liberties.

In the year 1938. His *Majesty* having understood, that the authorizing of the Service-Book, and Book of Canons, and the establishment of the High-Commission-Courts were illegal; did upon the representation of those grievances, not only retract what he had formerly done, but in the fullest manner discharged them, and though the *Articles of Perth* stood settled by Law, yet upon their petitions, who counted them grievances, he warranted their

their disuse: and for securing the fears of his Subjects of the change of Religion, (with which some factious spirits had poysoned them ;) he appointed the *National Covenant*, as King *James* had signed it, to be taken by all his Subjects with a bond of mutual defence and adherence to it: He also summoned an Assembly and Parliament, for satisfying all the just demands and grievances of his Subjects: But did this satisfy the zeal of that party? No, for when all colors of grounds were removed from those malicious imputations, with which his *Majesties* actions were aspersed; then did they flee to their safe and sure refuge of jealousies and fears, out of which there was never any storming of them, as if all had been only offered to trepan and deceive them. And after His *Majesty* had called a Synod at *Glasgow*, then came in the Lay-Elders, who were all of the Nobility, and men of the greatest eminence of the Kingdom, and carried the elections of the members of the Assembly in the most arbitrary manner imaginable: many instances whereof I can yet prove from authentick papers, one generall I shall only name, (for did I stand to reckon up all, I should never get to an end:) the ruling Elders who came from every Parioch to the Presbyteries, for electing the Commissioners to the Assembly, were men of power, and of
one

one knot; and so when it was voted what Ministers should be chosen, they who were listed, being at least six, were set to the door, and thus the Elders who staid within, carried the election as they pleased. And when the commissioned ruling Elder was chosen, they were all so associated, that they could not choose wrong. And thus it was, that the secular men did intirely choose the members of the Assembly of *Glasgow*. But before they went to it, a written citation of the Bishops was ordered to be read through all the Churches of *Scotland*; wherein they were charged, as guilty of all the crimes imaginable, which as an *Agape* after the Lords Supper, was first read after a Communion at *Edinburgh*: and upon it, orders were sent every where, for bringing in the privatest of their escapes. (And you may judge how consonant this was to that Royal Law of charity, *which covers a multitude of sins*) nor was the Kings Authority any whit regarded all this while. Was ever greater contempt put on the largest offers of grace and favor? And when at *Glasgow* His Majesty offered by his Commissioner, to consent to the limiting of Bishops, nothing would satisfy their zeal without condemning the order, as unlawful and abjured. But when many illegalities of the constitution and procedure of that Assembly were discovered

red, their partiality appeared, for being both Judg and Party, they justified all their own disorders. Upon which *His Majesties* Commissioner was forced to discharge their further sitting, or procedure, under pain of Treason : but withal published *His Majesties* Royal intentions to them, for satisfying all their legal desires, and securing their fears. But their stomachs were too great to yield obedience, and so they sate still, pretending their authority was from *C H R I S T*, and condemned Episcopacy, excommunicated the Bishops, with a great many other illegal and unjustifiable Acts. And when *His Majesty* came with an Army to do himself right by the Sword *GOD* had put in his hands, they took the start of him, and seized on his Castles, and on the houses and persons of his good Subjects, and went in a great body against him. Now in this *His Majesty* had the Law clearly of his side : For Episcopacy stood established by Act of Parliament. And if this was a cause of Religion, or a defence of it, much less such as deserved all that blood and confusion which it drew on, let all the World judg.

It is true, *His Majesty* was willing to settle things, and receive them again into his grace, and upon the matter granted all their desires : but they were unsatisfiable ; upon which they again armed. But of this I shall not recount the

particulars, because I hope to see a clear and unbiassed narration of these things ere long. Only one Villany I will not conceal, at the pacification at *Berwick*, seven Articles of Treaty were signed; But the Covenanters got a paper among them, which passed for the conditions of the agreement; though neither signed by his *Majesty*, nor attested by Secretary or Clerk: and this being every where spread, his *Majesty* challenged it as a Forgery: and all the *English* Lords who were of the Treaty, having declared upon Oath, that no such paper was agreed on, it was burnt at *London* by the hand of the Hangman, as a scandalous paper. But this was from the Pulpits in *Scotland*, represented as a violation of the Treaty, and that the Articles of it were burnt. These and such were the Arts the men of that time used to inflame that blessed King's native Subjects against him.

But all these were small matters to the following invasion of *England*, *An. 1643*. For his *Majesty* did *An. 1641*. come to *Scotland*, and give them full satisfaction to all, even their most unreasonable demands; which he consented to pass into Acts of Parliaments. But upon his return into *England*, the woful rupture betwixt him and the two Houses following; was our Church-party satisfied with the trouble they occasioned him? No, they were not: for they did
all

all they could to cherish and foment the Houses in their insolent Demands, chiefly about *Religion*: and were as forward in pressing *England's* uniformity with *Scotland*, as they were formerly in condemning the design of bringing *Scotland* to an uniformity with *England*.

I shall not engage further in the differences betwixt the King and the two Houses, than to shew that His *Majesty* had the Law clearly of his side, since he not only consented to the redress of all grievances, for which the least color of Law was alledged; but had also yielded to larger concessions for securing the fears of his Subjects, than had been granted by all the Kings of *England* since the *Conquest*. Yet their demands were unsatisfiable without His *Majesty* had consented to the abolishing of Episcopacy, and discharge of the Liturgy, which neither his Conscience, nor the Laws of *England* allowed of: so that the following War cannot be said to have gone on the principles of defending *Religion*; since His *Majesty* was invading no part of the established *Religion*. And thus you see, that the War in *England* was for advancing a pretence of *Religion*. And for *Scotland's* part in it, no Sophistry will prove it defensive: for His *Majesty* had settled all matters to their hearts desire, and by many frequent and solemn protestations, declared his resolutions of observing

inviolably that agreement: neither did he so much as require their assistance in that just defence of his Authority, and the Laws, invaded by the two Houses: though in the explication of the Covenant, *An. 1639.* it was agreed to, and sworn, *That they should in quiet manner, or in Arms, defend His Majesties Authority, within or without the Kingdom, as they should be required by His Majesty, or any having his Authority.* But all the King desired was, that Scotland might lie neutral in the quarrel, enjoying their happy tranquillity: yet this was not enough for your Churches zeal, but they remonstrated that Prelacy was the great Mountain stood in the way of Reformation, which must be removed, and they sent their Commissioners to the King with these desires, which *His Majesty* answered by a Writing yet extant under his own Royal hand, shewing, *That the present settlement of the Church of England was so rooted in the Law, that he could not consent to a change, till a new form were agreed to, and presented to him:* to which these at Westminster had no mind: but he offered *all ease to tender Consciences, and to call a Synod to judge of these differences, to which he was willing to call some Divines from Scotland, for bearing their opinions and reasons.* At that time, Petitions came in from several Presbyteries in Scotland, to the Conservators of the Peace, inciting them to own the Parliaments

ments quarrel: upon which many of the Nobility, and others, signed a *Cross Petition*, which had no other design, but the diverting these Lords from interrupting the *Peace of Scotland*, by meddling in the *English* quarrel: upon which Thunders were given out against these *Petitioners*, both from the Pulpits, and the *Remonstrances* of the *Commission* of the *General Assembly*; and they led *Processes* against all who subscribed it. But *His Majesty* still desired a neutrality from *Scotland*; and tho highly provoked by them, yet continued to bear, with more than humane patience, the affronts were put on his Authority. Yet for animating the people of *Scotland* into the designed War, the Leaders of that Party did every where study to poison the people with damnable jealousies of the *King's inclination to Popery*, of his accession to the *Massacre of Ireland*, and of his designs to subvert by force the late agreement with *Scotland*, if his Armies were blessed with success in *England*. It were an endless work to tell all the ways were used for rooting these wicked jealousies in the peoples hearts: neither were all *His Majesties* protestations able to overcome them: yet in end, when *His Majesty* finding what their *inclinations* were, did refuse to admit the *Commissioners* from *Scotland* to mediate betwixt himself and the Houses, they returned home; and immediately upon

that, contrary to all the Laws of *Scotland*, a great meeting of *Counsellors, Conservators, and Commissioners for the publick burdens*, ordained a *Convention of Estates* to be summoned, which was never before done without the King's command, except in the minority of the Kings: neither did they so much as wait for the King's pleasure, but only signified their resolution to him, and desired *His Commands* against the day prefixed. Here was an invasion of the King's *Prerogative*, which deserved a high Censure: yet so far did *His Majesty's* clemency, and love to his native Kingdom lead him, that he dispensed with this transgression, and allowed their sitting in a *Convention*, provided they meddled not in the business of *England*, nor raised an Army in order to it: But notwithstanding this, they voted themselves a *free Convention*, and not restricted to the bounds prescribed in the King's Letter, which they refused to registrate. And after this, they leagued with *England*. But having spoke my self out of breath, I quit the giving account of what follows to *Basilus*.

Basil. I have observed one defect in your Narration, for which I will be very favorable to you, because I intend to be guilty of that same fault my self; which is, that you have spoken nothing of the *National Covenant*, and I mean to say as little of the *League*. And I am apt to guess that
your

your silence was designed upon the same grounds that mine is: for indeed I can satisfy myself with nothing I can say upon the *League*, except I told all I know of the Arts and manner of its contrivance. And truly, I cannot prevail upon myself at present, for the saying of that. Therefore I will draw a vail over it, and say nothing, till I see further reason for a more full discovery; and then I am afraid *Isotimus* shall confess, it was not prudently done to have extorted it from me. But to quit this, and pursue the Narration *Philarcheus* hath devolved on me, I shall tell you how Commissioners came from *England* to treat for an Army from *Scotland*, for their assistance in the War they were then engaged in against the King: Upon which all Articles being agreed to, and a *League* sworn, an Army was sent into *England*, which turned the scales that did then hang in an even ballance, to the King's ruin. And truly, my invention cannot reach an argument, or color, for proving these to have been defensive Arms, they being the effect of a combination with the Subjects of *England* against our common King. But shall I next tell you what followed after the fatal revolution of things in *England*, upon his *Majesties* trusting himself to the *Scots Army*, I am sure I should fill your minds with horror. For though *His Majesty* offered Concessions, justly to be wondered

at, he having been willing to quit the *Militia* for divers years, and to set up *Presbytery* for three years; and that in the mean while there should be a *free Synod*, in order to a final settlement with other great diminutions of Royal Authority; which shew how willing he was at his own cost to have redeemed the *peace of his Kingdoms*: only he added, *that his Conscience could not allow him to take the Covenant*, nor authorize it by Law, nor consent to the abolition of *Episcopacy*, or the *Liturgy*; protesting that how soon he could do these things with a good Conscience, he should yield to all the desires of his Subjects: in the mean while, he intreated for a personal Treaty, in order to mutual satisfaction. Yet with how much fury did that Party press the settling of the *Government* without him, the disowning his interest, and the abandoning of his Person to his Enemies; tho at that very time, the designs of the *Seſtarian Party*, against both *Monarchy* and *His Majesties Person*, were breaking out, and had been made known to them by those who understood them well? What followed upon this, I wish my silence could bury from the knowledge of all the World. But, alas! it is too well known what infamy these Men brought upon themselves, and their Country: which in the Opinion of the World, was generally held guilty of that which was the Crime of the prevailing Party;

Party, whom the Leaders over-awed and influenced. But after that, when *His Majesty* was made Prisoner; when he was carried up and down by the Army; when the Army forced both the Houses, and the City of *London*; when the *Treaties* of *Scotland* were violated in all their Articles; when the Propositions agreed on by both *Kingdoms*, were laid aside, and the four Bills set in their place, wherein the *Covenant* was not mentioned; when upon *His Majesties* refusing of these he was made Prisoner, and the Vote of Non-addresses passed against him, then did the Loyalty of the *Scots Nation* begin again to revive: and what through the sense of duty, what through the remorse of their former actings, every one was forward to real resentments of these unworthy indignities put both on *their King and Country*: but when the *Parliament of Scotland* had voted the Country to be put in a posture of War for the defence of their *Sovereign*, then where should I end, if I told all the seditious Papers, Preachings, and Discourses of some of the *Clergy*, who contradicted and countermanded the *Parliament* to a height of unparallelled boldness, even after all their desires, which they gave in a large *Remonstrance*, were granted? But did that satisfy? No: they then took refuge in their *common Sanctuary* of jealousies and fears. They threatned
all

all who obeyed the commands of the *Parliament*, not only with their *Church-censures*, but with *damnation*. They did every where incite the people to rise in Arms against the *Parliaments Forces*: and at a *Communion at Matchlin*, they did so work upon the Vulgar, that they prevailed to get them draw up in a Body, promising them great assistance both from *G O D* and men. They kept a *correspondence* with the *Sectarian Army*, and continued by many Letters to press their speedy march unto *Scotland*; and after the *Scots Army* marched unto *England*, and was by the wise judgment of *G O D* defeated, then did many of the Ministers, with all the vehemence imaginable, inflame the people to Rebellion, and got them to rise, and they marched before their *Parishes* like Captains. They also called for the help of the *Sectarian Army* to them. And thus did they stand to the *Covenant*, in maintaining the *Privileges of Parliament*, and preserving the *King's Person and Authority*. And when *His Majesty* was murdered, what attempts made they for the *preservation of His Person*, or for the resenting it after it was done? This was the *Loyalty* of that Party; and this is what all Princes may expect from you, unless they be absolutely at your *Devotion*. Let these things declare whether these Wars went upon the grounds of a pure defence. But if next to this,

I should reckon up the instances of Cruelty that appeared in your Judicatories for several years, I should have too large a Theme to run through in a short Discourse. What cruel Acts were made against all who would not sign the *Covenant*? They were declared Enemies to *G O D*, the King, and the Country. Their persons were appointed to be seized on, and their goods confiscated. And in the *November* of the year 1643. when some of the most eminent of the Nobility refused to sign the *Covenant*, Commissions were given to Soldiers to bring them in Prisoners, warranting them to kill them if they made resistance. And, pray, whether had this more of the cruelty of *Antichrist*, or of the meekness of *JESUS*? Or shall I next tell you of the *bloody Tribunals* were at *S. Andrews*, and other places after *Philips-haugh*? And of the cruelty against those Prisoners of War, who bore Arms at the King's command, and in defence of his authority? What bloody Stories could I here tell, if I had not a greater horror at the relating them, than many of these high Pretenders had at the acting of them? And should I here recount the procedure of the *Kirk Judicatories*, against all who were thought disaffected, I would be look'd on as one telling *Romances*, they being beyond credit. What *Processess* of *Ministers* are yet upon Record, which have no better

better foundation than their not preaching to the times: their speaking with, or praying before *My Lord Montrose*: their not railing at the *Engagement*, and the like? And what cruelty was practised in the years 1649. and 1650? None of us are so young, but we may remember of it. A single death of one of the greatest of the Kingdom, could not satisfie the bloud-thirsty malice of that Party, unless made formidable and disgraceful, with all the shameful pageantry could be devised. Pray, do you think these things are forgotten? Or shall I go about to narrate, and prove them more particularly? I confess, it is a strange thing to see men who are so obnoxious, notwithstanding that so exalted in their own conceits: and withal remember that the things I have hinted at, were not the particular actings of single and private persons, but the publick and owned proceedings of the Courts and Judicatories. These are the grounds which persuaide me that with whatsoever fair colours some may varnish these things, yet the spirit that then acted in that Party, was not the Spirit of G O D.

Ifot. Truly, you have given in a high charge against the proceedings of the late times, which as I ought not to believe upon your assertion, so I cannot well answer; those being matters of fact, and done most of them before I was capable
of

of observing things : And therefore when I see men of great experience, I shall ask after the truth of what you have told me. But whatever might be the design of some *Politicians* at that time, or to whatever bad sense some words of the *League* may be stretched, yet you cannot deny, but they are capable of a good sense, and in that I own them, and so cleave to that *Oath of GOD*, which was intended for a *solemn Covenanting with GOD* : and the people meant nothing else by it, but a giving themselves to *Christ* : to whose truths and Ordinances they resolved to adhere at all hazards, and against all opposition : and in particular to oppose every thing might bear down the power and progress of *Religion*, which was the constant effect of *Pre-lacy* : therefore we are all bound to oppose it upon all hazards. And indeed when I remember of the *beauty of holiness* was then every where, and consider the licentious profanity, and scoffing at *Religion*, which now abounds : this is stronger with me than all arguments, to persuade me that these were the men of *G O D*, who had his *Glory* before their eyes in all they did, or designed : whereas now I see every one seeking their own things, and none the things of *JESUS CHRIST*. And all these plagues and evils which these Kingdoms do either groan under, or may apprehend, ought to be
 impu-

imputed to G O D S avenging wrath for a *broken Covenant*, which though taken by all from the highest to the lowest, is now condemned, reviled, abjured, and shamefully broken. These things should afflict our souls, and set us to our mournings, *if haply G O D may turn from the fierceness of his anger.*

Phil. As for these Articles that relate to the combination for engaging by arms in prejudice of the Kings Authority, or may seem to bind us to the reacting these Tragedies, they being founded on the lawfulness of Subjects resisting their Sovereigns, if the unlawfulness of that was already evinced, then any obligation can be in that compact for that effect, must be of it self null and void: and therefore, as from the beginning it was sinful to engage in these wars; so it will be yet more unlawful, if after all the evils we have seen, and the judgments we have smarted under, any would lick up that vomit: or pretend to bind a tyè on the Subjects Consciences to rise in arms against their Lawful Sovereign. And let me tell you freely, I cannot be so blind or stupid, as not to apprehend that G O D S wrath hath appeared very visibly against us now, for a tract of thirty years and more; neither doth his *anger seem to be turned away, but his hand is stretched out still.* But that which I look on as the greater matter of his con-

troverſie with us, is that the Rulers of our Church and State did engage the ignorant multitude, under the colors of *Religion*, to deſpiſe the *LORDS* anointed, and his *Authority*, and by Arms to ſhake off his yoaſk, and afterwards abandon his Perſon, diſown his intereſt, reſuſe to engage for his reſcuſe, and in the end look on tamely, and ſee him murdered. Do you think it a ſmall crime that nothing could ſatiſfie the Leaders in that time, without they got the poor people entangled into things which they knew the vulgar did not, and could not underſtand, or judge of, and muſt implicitly rely upon the Gloſſes of their Teachers? For whatever the *General Aſſembly* declared, was a duty following upon the *Covenant* (which was an eaſie thing for the leading men to carry as they pleaſed) then all the Miniſters muſt either have preached and publiſhed that to their people, with all their zeal, otherwiſe they were ſure to be turned out. The people being thus provoked from the Pulpits, they were indeed to be pitied, who being engaged in an oath (many of them, no doubt in ſinglenefs of heart, having the fear of an oath upon their conſciences) and not being able to examine things to the bottom, were entangled thus, and engaged which way the *leading Church-men* pleaſed. and the guilt of this, as it was great in thoſe who without due conſideration

tion engaged in those oaths, so it was most fearful in them; who against the clear *convictions of conscience*, were prevailed upon by the thunders of the Church, or the threats of the State, to swear what they judged sinful. I confess, their crime was of a high and crying nature, who did thus for the love of this present world, not only make *shipwreck of a good conscience*, but persisted long in a tract of dissembling with G O D, and juggling with men. But the wickedness of this comes mainly to their door, who tempted them to prevarication by their severities against all refused a concurrence in these courses. And the sin of all this was the greater, that it was carried on with such pretences, as if it had been the cause and work of G O D, with fasting, prayers, tears, and shews of devotion. For these things the Land mourns, and G O D continues his controverſie against us. To which I must add the great impenitence of those who being once engaged in that course of *Rebellion*, have not yet repented of the works of their hands. For even such as own a *conviction* for it, do not express that horror and remorse at their by-past crimes which become penitents: But think if by rioting, drinking and swearing, they declare themselves now of another mind than formerly they were of, that they are washed free of that defilement. In a word, none seem deeply humbled in the
presence

presence of G O D, for the sinfulness of these practices, into which they entered themselves, and engaged others. And till I see an ingenuous spirit of *confessing and repenting* for these great evils, for all that rebellion, that blood, oppression, and vastation which these courses drew on, I shall never expect a *National pardon*, for that *National guilt*. For when on the one hand, many are still justifying these black Arts, and not humbled for them; nor owning their penitence as openly as they committed their sins: And on the other hand, these who confess the faultiness of their courses, do it in a spirit of traducing others, of railing, and reviling, perhaps not without Atheistical scoffings at *true Religion*; but not in a spirit of ingenuous horror, and sorrow for their own accession to these courses, it appears we are still hardened, either into a judicial blindness of the one hand, or of obduration of heart on the other.. That profanity doth much abound, I must with sorrow confess it, in the presence of my GOD : And I know there are many who roll themselves in the dust daily before G O D, and mourn bitterly for it : But when I enter in a deeper inquiry what may be the true causes of it, those that occur to me are, first, a judicial stroke from GOD upon us, for our by-past abominations : and chiefly for our hypocritical mocking of G O D, fastning the

designs or humors of a Party on him, as if they had been his Ordinances, interests, and truths. And therefore because *we held the truth of GOD in unrighteousness*, his wrath hath been revealed against us. Next, the frequent involving the Land in reiterated Oaths, subscriptions, and professions of repentance, under severe Censures, which prevailed with many to swallow them over implicitly, and made others yield to them against their Conscience, hath so debauched and prostituted the Souls of people, that it is no wonder, they be now, as seared with a hot Iron, and incapable of reproofs or convictions. Besides, is it any wonder that these whose hearts naturally led them to Atheism, when they see what juggling was used about some pretences of Religion, and how the whole Land was involved in so much bloud, about such trifling matters, come thereupon to have a jealousy of Preachers and preaching, as if all they said, was but to maintain and advance their own interests and greatness, and thereupon turn Scoffers at all Religion, because of the base and irreligious practices of some, who yet vouched *GOD and CHRIST* for all they did? And on remark I shall offer on the way, that the sin of your Church was legible in your judgment: their sin was the animating the people to Rebellion, upon colors of Religion; and their judgment was, not only

only to be subdued, and oppressed by another rebellious Army, who were not wanting to pretend highly to the cause of *G O D* in all their actings: but that they brake in pieces among themselves about a decision, who might be employed to serve in the Army, which at first disjointed, and afterwards destroyed your Church: and the schism is still among us, which is like to eat up the power of Religion, is but the dreg and genuin effect of these courses, and so all the prejudice it produceth to Religion, and the true interests of Souls is to be charged upon that same score.

Isot. Really, I am much scandalized with this Discourse, which if it were heard abroad, I know would much offend the hearts of the *LORD's* people. And indeed, I think it ought not to be answered, no more than *Rabshaketh's* railings were by *Eliakim*. I wish I could with good *Hezekiah* spread it out before the *L O R D*, and mourn over it; and for you who do so blaspheme *G O D*, and his Cause. But whatever you may say in the point of Resistance, yet you cannot deny, but we are all from the highest to the lowest bound in our stations (at least) to withstand Prelacy, against which we did so formally swear in that Oath of *G O D*, which most of you are not only content to break, but must needs despise and mock at.

Phil. GOD is my witness, how little pleasure I have in this severe Discourse, into which the petulancy of these Writers hath engaged me: but examine what I said from *Religion* and Reason, and you will perhaps change your verdict of it. For my part, I say none of these things in a corner, neither do I expect that they shall not fly abroad, and if they do, I will look for all the severities which the censures and malice of many can amount to. But I will cheerfully bear that cross, and will be content to be yet more vile, for declaring freely what I judge to be GOD's Controversie with the Land I live in. If for this love to Souls, many be my Adversaries, I will betake my self to prayer: and shall only add this, that few who know me suspect my temper guilty either of flattery or bitterness. And the searcher of hearts knows, that I neither design by this freedom, to commend my self to any, nor to disgrace others, but merely to propose things as they are. If this produce any good effect, I have my design; if not, I have discharged my conscience, and leave the issue of it with GOD, who can out of the mouths of babes and sucklings, ordain strength and perfect praise.

As for any obligation you may suppose the Covenant brings upon us to oppose Episcopacy, I shall discuss it with all the clearness I am
master

master of. I shall not tell you, how much many who took that Covenant, and do still plead its obligation have said (from the words of the second Article, and the explication given in it to Prelacy) for reconciling as much of Episcopacy as is settled among us, to it, according to the declared meaning of its first imposers, when they took it, and authorized it. But leaving you and them to contend about this, upon the whole matter consider, that Episcopacy is either necessary, unlawful, or indifferent: if the first be true, then you will without much ado confess that no Oath in prejudice of a necessary duty, can bind any tie upon our conscience. If it be unlawful, I shall freely acknowledg that from the oaths of the Covenants, there is a supervenient tie lying on us for its extirpation. But if it be indifferent, then I say it was a very great sin for a Nation, so far to bind up their Christian liberty, as by Oath to determine themselves to that to which GOD had not obliged them: for the circumstances of things indifferent, may so far vary, that what is of it self indifferent, may by the change of these become necessary, or unlawful. Therefore, in these matters, it is a great invasion of our Christian liberty, to fetter consciences with Oaths. And though the Rulers and chief Magistrates of a Society, have either rashly or out of fear, or upon other unjustifiable

accounts, sworn an Oath, about indifferent things, which afterwards becomes highly prejudicial to the *Society*, then they must consider that the *Government* of that *State* is put in their hands by *G O D*, to whom they must answer for their administration. Theeefore they stand bound by the *Laws of Nature, of Religion, and of all Societies*, to do every thing that may tend most for the good of the *Society*. And if a *Case* fall in where a thing tends much to the good and peace of a *Land*, but the *Prince* stands bound some way or other by Oath against it, he did indeed sin by so swearing; but should sin much more, if by reason of that Oath he judged himself limited from doing what might prove for the good of the *Society*. Indeed when an Oath concerns only a man's private rights, it ties him to performance, *tho to his hurt*; but the *administration of Government* is none of these rights a *Magistrate* may dispose of at pleasure; For he must conduct himself so, as he shall be answerable to *God*, whose *Vicegerent* he is: and when these two *Obligations* interfere, the one of procuring the good of the *Society*, the other of adhering to an Oath, so that they stand in terms of direct opposition, then certainly the greater must swallow up the lesser. It is therefore to be under consideration, whether the *Obligation* of procuring the good of the *Society*, or that
of

of the Magistrates Oath be the greater? But this must be soon decided, if it be considered that the former is an Obligation lying on him by GOD, who for that end raised him up to his power, and is indeed the very end of *Government*: whereas the other is a voluntary engagement he hath taken on himself, and can never be equal to that which was antecedent to it, much less juggle it out. But if it contradict the other, the Magistrate is indeed bound to repent for his rash swearing; but cannot be imagined from that to be bound to go against the good of the *Society*, for the procuring whereof, he hath the Sword and power put in his hands by GOD: And so much of the tie can lie upon a Magistrate by his Oath about things indifferent, in ordering or governing the State that is subject to him: in which he must proceed as he shall answer to GOD in the great day of his accounts: and ought not to be censured or judged for what he doth by his Subjects.

But he enacting Laws in matters indifferent, they become necessary Obligations on his Subjects, which no private oath of theirs can make void. Indeed the late Writer his arguing against this, is so subtil, that I cannot comprehend it so far as to find sense in it; for he confesseth, *Pag.* 232. *That the Magistrate is vested with a power proportional to the ends of Government, so that no*

Subject may decline his lawful commands, or bind himself by any such Oath, as may interfere with a supervenient rational command. All this is sound, and indeed all I pleaded; only his explication of rational, I cannot allow of: For tho a Magistrate may proceed to unreasonable commands, yet I see no limits set to our obedience, but from the unlawfulness of them. But in the next page, he eats all this up by telling, That there are many things still left to our selves, and our own free disposal, wherein we may freely vow: and having vowed, must not break our word. And for instance, he adduceth a mans devoting the tenth of his substance to the Lord, from which no countermand of the Magistrates can excuse. But still he concludes, Page 334. That the Magistrates Power may make void such vows as are directly, or designedly made to frustrate its right, or to suspend the execution of others, in so far as they do eventually cross its lawful exercise. This last yields to me all I pretend in this case: For the Covenant being made on purpose to exclude Episcopacy, though at that time settled by Law: if Episcopacy be not unlawful, but lawful, which I now suppose, then the King's authority enjoining it, and it being a great part likewise of the Government of the Subjects, it is to be submitted to, notwithstanding the Oath made against it. So that your Friend yields without consideration, that which he thinks he denies:

and

and therefore the reasoning in the *Dialogues* holds good, that the Oath of a Subject in a matter indifferent, cannot free him from the obedience he owes the Laws. It is true, his *private vows* in matters of his own concern, are of another nature, and so not within the compass of this Debate, which is only about *the obedience we owe the Laws*, supposing their matter lawful, notwithstanding our Compacts made in opposition to them: and therefore I shall not discourse of them, but stick close to the purpose in hand. But my next undertaking must be to free Children from any tie may be imagined to lie on them from the Fathers Oath: which was a matter so clear to my thinking, that I wonder what can be said against it.

Isot. Indeed here your Friend the *Conformist* bewrayed his ignorance notably, not considering the authority Parents have over their Children by *divine command*, which dies not with them; their commands being obligatory even after their death: for God commends the *Rechabites* for obeying *Jonadabs* command some ages after his death: Therefore Parents adjuring Children, they are obliged by it, as the people of *Israel* by *Saul's* adjuring them not to eat food till the evening, were obliged to obedience. And such adjurations may not only bind the Children adjured, but all their posterity after them: as
did

did the Oath for carrying *Joseph's* bones out of *Egypt*. And further, a *Society* continuing still under the same notion, is bound through all ages to make good the compacts of their *Progenitors*, they continuing to be the same *Society*. And this is not only the ground on which the obligation of all alliances among Kingdoms is founded; but is also the *basis* on which our tie to the *Allegiance due to our Sovereign* is grounded. Therefore as we find *GOD* in Scripture covenanting with Men, and their posterity, as in *Abraham's* case, and Fathers likewise engaging to *GOD* for themselves and their Children, as did *Joshua* for himself and his House; so our *Covenants* being unanimously sworn by almost the whole Nation, and confirmed by all the authority in it, must have a perpetual obligation on all the subsequent Generations. See from pag. 205. to pag. 219.

Phil. I suppose, if it hold good that the *Covenant* binds not these who took it, to oppose or extirpate *Episcopacy* when settled by Law, all this reasoning will of it self vanish in smoke: But to give your Discourse all advantage, and to yield its obligation on these who took it, what you infer will never be made out; since it is founded on the supposition of a Parents authority to adjure his Child, that ties him after his Fathers death, which you apply to the *Covenant*.

But

But in this there is a triple error committed by you: one of fact, and two of right. That of fact, is, that you suppose that in the *Covenant* the subsequent generations are adjured to its observance: whereas not a word of this is in the *Covenant*. On the contrary, in the end of the Preface to the *League*, it is said, that *every one for himself doth swear*: Neither is there a word in it all that imports an adjuration on *posterity*. It is true, in the 5. *Article*, every one is bound according to their place and interest, to endeavour that the *Kingdoms may remain conjoined in a firm peace and union to all posterity*. But he that will draw an adjuration on posterity from this, must have a new *Art of Logick*, not yet known. And in the *National Covenant*, as it was taken by King *James*, there is not a word that imports an adjuration on posterity. It is true, in the addition was made to it, *Ann. 1638.* it is declared, *That they are convinced in their minds, and confess with their mouths, that the present and subsequent generations in this Land, were bound to keep that National Oath and subscription inviolable.* But this was only their opinion who signed it: Yet for all that, there is no adjuration on posterity for observing it, no not in that *Addition* then sworn to. The next error of your *Hypothesis*, is, that the Parents commands can bind the *Childrens conscience*, in prejudice of the Magistrates authority: for you must

must either suppose this, otherwise your arguing is to no purpose, since the King's authority is in this case interposed, and therefore all our Fathers commands must yield to it : which because none deny, I shall not stand to evince. For if my Father be bound to obey the King, as well as I am; both he sins, if he enjoin me disobedience, and I am likewise guilty, if upon that I disobey. For he that hath no warrant for his own disobedience, can be imagined to have none for securing me in mine. And in end, you suppose a Parents command or authority can bind the Conscience after his death : which is manifestly absurd ; for certainly his authority must die with himself. It is true, a piety and reverence is due to the memory of our Parents : and so much reverence should be payed to their ashes, that without a very good reason, the things they enjoined should be religiously observed : but this is not a necessary Obligation : for circumstances may so vary things, that we may be assured, that as our Parents enjoined such a thing, so had they seen the inconveniencies of it, they had not done it. Now while a Father lives, a Child hath this liberty to argue with him : where it is not to be doubted, but the affection of a Parent, together with the reasons adduced would make him change his Commands : but indeed did their Commands tie us
after

after their death, we should be more in subjection to our Parents, when dead, than we were when they lived : which goeth against the sense of all mankind. And what equality is there in such mens reasons, who will deny absolute obedience to Magistrates, tho we be allowed to petition, and represent the grievances their Laws bring upon us, and yet will assert an absolute and blind obedience due to the commands of our Parents, tho dead ? Your instance of the *Rechabites* makes against you, for their Progenitors had appointed them to dwell in Tents, yet the fear of *Nebuchadnezzar* had driven them to *Jerusalem* : and consider if the incurring our lawful Sovereigns displeasure, together with the hazard such obedience may draw after it, be not a juster ground of excusing our selves from obedience to any such Command, suppose it were real. The *Rechabites* did indeed abstain from Wine; upon *Jonadab's* command, for which they are commended, and blessed ; and so I acknowledg it a piece of piety to obey the commands even of a dead Father ; yet in that place, it is not asserted, that that Command tied their Conscience ; but on the contrary, the blessing passed upon their obedience, seems rather to imply that it was voluntary, though generous and dutiful. The same Answer is to be made to *Joseph's* adjuring the Children

dren

dren of *Israel* to carry up his bones; which ought to have obliged even the Children of these that were so adjured, out of the gratitude due to the memory of so great a Man, especially nothing intervening that rendered obedience to it, either unexpedient or unlawful.

But in general, consider that when a contract is made, either of an *Association* under a form and line of Magistracy, or of alliance betwixt two States, and confirmed by Oath; there is an obligation of Justice that ariseth from the Compact, whereby such rights were translated unto the person compacted with: and thereby he and his posterity according to the Compact, are to enjoy these Rights, because translated unto his person by the Compact: but being once legally his, with a provision that they shall descend to his Heirs, then his Heirs have a right to them formally in their persons after his death, to which they have a title in justice, and not by the fidelity to which the posterity of the first compacters are bound by their Fathers deed, but because the right is now theirs: so that though the first Compacters were bound by promise and Oath, their Successors are only bound by the rules of justice, of giving to every man that which is his right: therefore whatever our *Ancestors* may be supposed to have compacted with the *Kings Progenitors*, or whatever by Treaty
one

one State yields over to another, that *Promise, Donation and Oath* is indeed the ground on which the Kings right may be supposed to have been first founded. But now his Title to our Obedience proceeds upon the rules of Justice, (of giving him what is his, by an immemorial Possession, passed all prescription, so many ages ago, that the first vestiges of it cannot be traced from *Records*, or certain *Histories*) and not of fidelity of observing the promises of our *Ancestors* to him, though I do not deny a pious Veneration to be due to the Promises and Oaths of Parents, when they contain in them adjurations on their Childern. And thus the *Gibeonites* having a right to their lives, confirmed to them by the Compact of the Princes of *Israel*: they and their Posterity had a good title in Justice to their lives, which was basely invaded by *Saul*, and had this aggravation, that the compact made with them was confirmed by oath, for which their posterity should have had a just veneration: But though that Oath did at first found their title to their Lives, and their Exemption from the forfeiture all the *Amorites* lay under; yet afterwards their title was preserved upon the *rules of Justice*, and the *Laws of Nature*, which forbid the invading the lives of our Neighbors, when by no Injury they forfeit them. Thus your confounding the titles of Inheritance

heritance and prescription, with the grounds upon which they first accresced, hath engaged you into all this mistaking. But from all this, you see how ill founded that reasoning of the *Answerer of the Dialogues* is, for proving the posterity of these who took the *Covenant*, tied by their fathers oath, which yet at first view, promised as fair colors of reason, as any part of his Book, had he not intermixed it with shameful insultings and railings at the *Conformist*: which I suppose do now appear as ill grounded, as they are cruel and base. But I am not so much in love with that stile, as to recriminate: nor shall I tell you of his errors that way of which I am in good earnest ashamed upon his account: For it is a strange thing, if a man cannot answer a discourse without he fall a fleering and railing. To conclude this whole purpose, I am mistaken, if much doubting will remain with an ingenuous and unprejudged Reader, if either we or our posterity lye under any obligation from the *Covenants*, to contradict or counteract the Laws of the Land, supposing the matter of them lawful: which being a large Subject, will require a discourse apart. But I will next examine some practices among us, and chiefly that of Schism and separation from the publick worship of *G O D*; to which both the unity of the Spirit, which we ought to preserve in the bond
of

of peace, and the lawful commands of these in authority, do so bind us, that I will be glad to hear what can be alledged for it.

Isot. A great difference is to be made betwixt separation and non-compliance: the one is a withdrawing from what was once owned to be the Church: the other is a with-holding our concurrence from what we judg brought in upon the Church, against both Reason and Religion: and any thing you can draw from *CHRIST*'s practice or precept, in acknowledging the *High Priests*, or commanding the people to observe what the *Pharisees* taught them, is not applicable to this purpose: For first, these were Civil Magistrates, as well as Ecclesiasticks, and Doctors of the Civil and Judicial Law, which is different from the Case of Churchmen with us. Further, the *Jewish Church* was still in possession of the privileges given them from *G O D*, and so till *CHRIST* erected his Church, they were the Church of *G O D*: and therefore to be acknowledged, and joined with in Worship. But how vastly differs our Case from this? See from p. 189. to p. 204.

Phil. You have given a short account of the large reasonings of the late Book on this head, only he is so browilled in it, that there are whole pages in his Discourse, which I confess my weakness cannot reach. But to clear the way

R

for

for your satisfaction in this matter, which I look upon as that of greatest concernment, next to the Doctrine of Non-resistance, of any thing is debated among us; since it dissolves the unity of the Church; and opens a patent door to all disorder, Ignorance and Profanity. I shall consider what the unity of the Church is, and in what manner we are bound to maintain and preserve it.

All Christians are commanded to love one another, and to live in peace together: and in order to this, they must also unite, and concur in joint Prayers, Adorations, and other acts of Worship, to express the harmony of their love in Divine matters: Sacraments were also instituted for uniting the body together; being solemn and federal stipulations, made with *God*, in the hands of some who are his Ambassadors and Representatives upon Earth: by whose mouths the Worship is chiefly offered up to *God*, and who must be solemnly called and separated for their Employment. Now these Assemblings of the Saints are not to be forsaken, till there be such a Corruption in the Constitution of them, or in some part of the Worship, that we cannot escape the guilt of that, without we separate our selves from these unclean things. Wherefore the warning is given, *Come out of Babylon, that we be not partakers of her sins*

sins, and so receive not of her plagues. But though there be very great and visible corruptions in a Church; yet as long as our joining in Worship in the solemn Assemblies, doth not necessarily involve us into a Consent or Concurrence with these; we ought never to withdraw, nor rent the unity of the body, whereof **CHRIST** is the head. Consider, *how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity.* And our Saviour sheweth of what importance he judged it to his Church, since so great a part of his last and most ravishing Prayer, is, *That they might be one:* And this he five times repeats, comparing the unity he prayed for, to the *undivided Unity was betwixt him and his Father.* How shall these words rise up in Judgment, against those who have broken these *bonds of perfection* upon slight grounds! With the same earnestness do we find the Apostles pressing the *Unity of the Body, and Charity* among all the members of it: which is no where more amply done than in the *Epistles to the Corinthians*, whom the Apostle calls, *the Churches of GOD*; and yet there were among them false Teachers, who studied to prey upon them, and to strike out the *Apostles authority*: Some among them denied the *resurrection*, there were Contentions and Disorders among them in their meetings: such confusions were from the *strange Tongues* some spake, that had one unac-

quainted with them, come in upon them, he had judged them mad: some were drunk when they did receive the *L O R D*'s Supper: they had an incestuous Person in their *Society*; and it seems he was of quality, and much accounted of, since they were puffed up with him: they were also a scandal to the Gospel with their litigious Law suits. These were great evils, and I hope beyond what you can charge on us: and yet though the Apostle commands them to be redressed, and rectified, doth he ever allow of these in *Corinth*, who were pure and holy, to forsake the *solemn Assemblies*, till these things were amended? Or doth he not highly commend *Charity* and *Unity* to them? Next, consider what Teachers these were who preached *CHRIST* of envy and strife, out of contention, and not sincerely, that they might add affliction to the *Apostles bonds*: And yet of these *S. Paul's* verdict is, *What then? notwithstanding every way, whether in pretence, or in truth, CHRIST is preached, and I therein do rejoice, yea, and will rejoice.* Now if he rejoiced that *Christ* was preached at any rate, what Spirit have they, who because they suppose some preach out of Envy, or design to add to their affliction, do thereupon study to blast their *reputation*, and to withdraw first the Hearts, and then the Ears of all from them? Certainly, this is not the Spirit of
Christ

CHRIST, or of his Apostles. And though we see what corruptions had crept into the Churches of *Asia*, yet in the *Epistles* to them in the *Revelation*, they are still call'd the Churches of G O D, in the midst of whom the Son of G O D walked. They are indeed commanded to reform any corruptions were among them ; but such as *had not that doctrine, and knew not the depths of Satan, but had kept their garments clean*, are not commanded to separate from the rest : on the contrary, *no other burden is laid upon them* ; nor are they charged for not separating from the rest. From which premises I may infer, that as long as the *Communion of Saints* may be kept in, without our being polluted in some piece of sinful concurrence, all are bound to it, under the hazard of tearing *Christ's Body* to pieces. And this stands also with the closest Reason ; for since *Unity* is that which holds all the body firm, whereas *division* dislocates and weakens it ; nothing doth more defeat the ends of *Religion*, and overturn the power of *Godliness*, than *Scisms* and *Contentions* ; which give the greatest offence to the little ones, and the fullest advantages to the common enemy imaginable. If therefore the Worship of G O D among us continue undefiled, even in the confession of all ; if the Sacraments be administred as before ; if the Persons that officiate be Ministers of the

Gospel, then certainly such as separate from our publick Meetings, do *forsake the Assemblies of the Saints, and so break the unity of the Spirit, and the bond of Peace.* And what you said of a non-compliance as distinct from separation, hath no relation to this purpose, where nothing of a compliance is in the case, but only a joining with the *Saints in solemn Worship.* And doth the change of the *Government of the Church*, in so small a matter as the fixing a constant President, with some additions of power over your *Synods*, in stead of your *ambulatory Moderators*, derive a Contagion into our Worship, so that without a Sin it cannot be joined in? Indeed if a Concurrence of Worship required an owning of every particular in the Constitution of the Church, a man must go to the *New Atlantis* to seek a *Society* he shall join with, since few of clear unpreposessed minds will find such *Societies* in the known Regions of the World, against all whose Constitutions they have not some just exceptions: and the World shall have as many parties as persons, if this be not fixed as the *rule of Unity*, that we cleave to it, ever till we be driven to do somewhat which with a good Conscience we cannot yield to. And even in that case, except the corruption be great and deep, a bare withdrawing, without a direct opposition, is all we are bound to. You are therefore guilty of a direct separation
 who

who forsake the *Assemblies of the Saints*, they continuing in their former purity, unchanged and unmixed, even in your own Principles.

Isot. But one thing is not considered by you, which is a main point, that we had our Church settled, according to CHRIST'S appointment, and ratified by Law. And a change of that being made, all our faithful Ministers were turned out by the tyranny of the present Powers; who in stead thereof, have set up a new form of *Government*, of none of CHRIST'S appointment: and to maintain it, have thrust in upon the LORD'S People, a company of weak, ignorant, scandalous and godless Men, called *Curates*; who in stead of edifying, study to destroy the flock: of whom I could say much, had I a little of your virulent temper: But their own actions have so painted them out to the world, that I may well spare my labor of making them better known, it being as unnecessary as it is unpleasant. Now if the true seekers of GOD do still stick to their old Teachers, and seek wholesome food from them in corners, and are afraid of your false Teachers, according to CHRIST's command, of being aware of such men; call you this a *separation*? which is rather an adherence to the true Church, and the *keeping of our Garments clean* from the contagion of these men. And indeed these who

do join with your *Curates*, do profit so little by their Ministry, that no wonder others have no heart to it. And I have known some whose *consciences* are so tender in this matter, that their having at sometimes joined with these *Curates* in Worship, hath been matter of mourning to them, even to their graves. And this may serve to clear us of the guilt of *Schism* in this matter, when our withdrawing is only a *non-compliance* with your corruption.

Phil. All this saith nothing for justifying your *separation*. As for the turning out of your *Ministers*, if the Laws to which their obedience was required were just (which shall be next considered) then their *prejudices, misinformed consciences, or peevishness*, and not the tyranny of the Rulers, must bear the blame of it. And for these set in their places, if upon so great a desertion of the Church by so many Churchmen, all their charges could not be of a sudden supplied with men so well qualified, or of such gifts and worth as was to be desired; it is nothing but what might have been expected upon such an occasion. And for your revilings, they well become the spirit which appears too visibly in the rest of your actings; but we still study to bear these base and cruel reflections, with the patience becoming the *Ministers of the Gospel*, and of these who study to learn of him, *who when*

he was reviled, reviled not again; but stood silent at those unjust Tribunals, when he was falsely and blasphemously reproached by his enemies; and therefore I shall leave answering of these fearful imputations you charge on our Clergy, to the great day of reckoning, wherein judgment shall return to the righteous, and all the upright in heart shall follow it. And in the mean while shall study to bless when you curse, and pray for you who do thus despitefully use us. We trust our witness is on high, that whatever defects cleave to us, and though, may be, we have not wanted a corrupt mixture (as you know among whom there was a son of Perdition) yet we are free of these things you charge on us promiscuously, and that these imputations you charge us with, are as false as they are base. But all this will not serve the turn of many of your dividers, whose Ministers continue with them as formerly, and meerly because they hold themselves bound in Conscience to obey the Laws they are separated from. Truly if you can clear this of separation, you are a Master at subtil reasoning. For you know it is not the third part of this Church which was abandoned by the former Ministers upon the late change, and yet the humor of separating is universal. And though some few of your own Ministers have had the honest zeal to witness against this separation, yet how have they

they being pelted for it by the censures and writings of other *Schismaticks*? which have prevailed so much upon the fear or prudence of others, that whatever dislike they had of these *separating practices*, yet they were willing either to comply in practice, or to be silent *spectators* of so great an evil. But if *separation* be a Sin, it must have a guilt of a high nature, and such as all who would be thought zealous watch-men, ought to warn their people of. And what shall be said of these (even Church-men) who at a time when the Laws are sharply looked to, do join in our Worship; but if there be an unbending in these, they not only withdraw, and become thereby a scandal to others, but draw about them divided Meetings; are not these time-servers? For if concurrence in our Worship be lawful, and to be done at any time, it must be a duty which should be done at all times: and therefore such *Masters of Conscience* ought to express an equality in their ways, and that they make the rules of their *concurrence in worship*, to be the Laws of G O D, and not the fear of civil punishments. Finally, such as think it lawful to join in our Worship, and yet that they may not displease the people, do withdraw, shew they prefer the pleasing of men to the pleasing of G O D: and that they make more account of the one than of the other. For if it be lawful to *concur in our worship*,
 what

what was formerly said, proves it a duty: Are not these then the servants of men, who to please them, dispense with what by their own concession must be a duty? Besides, such persons withdrawing, gives a great and real scandal to the vulgar, who are led by their Example, and so a humor of *separating* comes to be derived into all: whereby every one thinks it a piece of Religion, and that which will be sure to make him considerable, and bring customers to him, if he be a Merchant or Trades-man, that he despise the solemn Worship, and rail at his Minister: and if he but go to Conventicles, and be concern'd in all the humors of the Party, he is sure of a good name, be he as to other things what he will.

End. Much of this we know to be too true: and certainly, nothing deserves more blame for all the disorders are among us than this separation. Discipline goes down, Catechising is despised, the Sacraments are loathed, the solemn Worship deserted. I know the poor *Curates* bear the blame of all, and all of them must be equally condemned, if a few of them have miscarried; for which when ever it was proved, they were censured condignly: In end, you charge their gifts, and that their People are not edified by them: But I pray you, see whether the prejudices you make them drink in
against

against them, occasion not that. For it is a more than humane work, to overcome prejudices. Read but the complaints of the Prophets, and you will confess a Churchmans not being profitable to his People, will be no good argument to prove him not sent of GOD, And when I consider, that even the Apostles call for the help of the Churches Prayers, *that utterance might be given to them, yea and desire them to strive together in their Prayers for them*; I must crave leave to tell you, that the defect of that utterance, and power in preaching you charge on the present Preachers, may be well imputed to the want of the concurrence of the Peoples Prayers, whom prepossessions have kept from striving together with them in Prayer, that they might come among them *with the fulness of the blessing of the Gospel*. And if there be any of such tender and mislead Consciences, who have been smitten with remorse for such concurrence in Worship, as their tenderness is to be valued, so their ignorance is to be pitied: and they who thus mislead them, deserve the heavier censure, since they have involved simple and weak Consciences with their pedling Sophistry into such straits and doubts. In fine, you cannot say, that a Minister is by a Divine right placed over any particular flock. If then it be humane, it with all other things of that nature, is within
the

the Magistrates cognizance ; so that when he removes one, and leaves a legal way patent for bringing in another, upon which there comes one to be placed over that flock, what injustice soever you can fancy in such dealing, yet certainly, it will never free that Parish from the tie of associating in the publick Worship, or receiving the Sacraments from the hands of that Minister, whom they cannot deny to be a Minister of the Gospel: and therefore no irregularity in the way of his entry, though as great as can be imagined, will warrant the peoples separating from him. Neither can they pretend that the first Incumbent is still their Minister, for his relation to them being founded meerly on the Laws of the Church, it is (as was proved in the Second Conference) subject to the Magistrates authority, and so lasts no longer than he shall dissolve it by his commands: unless it appear, that he designs the overthrow of true Religion; in which case, I confess Pastors are, according to the practice of the first Ages of the Church, to continue at the hazard of all persecutions, and feed their flocks. But this is not applicable to our Case, where all that concerns Religion continues as formerly: only some combinations made in prejudice of the Supreme Authority are broken: and order is restored to the Church, instead of the confusions and divisions

sions were formerly in it. And if this change have occasioned greater disorders, wherever the defect of Policy or Prudence may be charged, yet certainly, if the change that is made, be found of its own nature both lawful and good, the confusions have followed upon it, are their guilt, who with so little reason, and so much eagerness, have not only refused obedience themselves, but hindered such as were willing to have yielded it.

Crit. Indeed this point of withdrawing from the publick worship, for their faultiness who officiate, or for the errors are supposed to be in the way of their entry, doth so contradict the whole series of the Sacred Rule, that nothing can be more expressly condemned in it. The Sons of *Eli* made the People abhor the offering, and they defiled the Tabernacle of *G O D*; yet for all that, the people continued to come and offer their Sacrifices. The Prophets do also tell us what kind of People the Priests in their times were, and yet never a word of the peoples withdrawing from the Worship. Now this must by the parity of reason, hold good under the *New Dispensation*; except you say, we are not so much obliged to worship *G O D* in the unity of the Spirit, as they were; the contrary whereof will be found true. Next, the *High Priesthood* being entailed on the line of *Aaron*,
was

was certainly to descend (as all other rights did among the *Jews*) by the right of representation and primogeniture; and so did *Eleazer* and *Phinehas* follow in a line from *Aaron*. It is true, the *High Priesthood* was afterwards in *Itbamar's* line, but it doth not appear by what conveyance it went to them, which certainly must have been Divine, if lawful: And none can limit *GOD* from dispensing with his own positive Laws. But the *High Priesthood* was again set in its own channel by *David*, and so continued downward, till after the second Temple, it becoming the chief Secular Power, was exposed to sale: and this appears from a passage cited by *Doctor Lightfoot* out of the *Talmud* of *Jerusalem*, in the first Temple the *High Priests* still served, the Son succeeding the Father, and they were 18 in number: but in the second Temple they got the *High Priesthood* by money. And some say, they destroyed one another by witchcraft: so that some say, there were 80 Priests in that space; some 81, some 82, some 83, some 84, and some 85. And that Learned Doctor reckons 53 in order, till he brings the Succession down to the time of the Wars, after which it was so confused, that he pursues it no further. And in the beginning of the 3 chap. of his *Temple-service*, he proves the *High Priesthood* to have descended to the first-born, as the Priesthood, before the Law, belonged to the first

first-born of every Family. And therefore it was that when *Simeon the Just* would have put *Onias* his second Son in the Priesthood, he could not do it. But *Simeon* the eldest Brother obtained his right, and *Onias* was put to fly to *Egypt*, where he built a famous Temple. This will prove that the High Priests in our Saviour's time had no just title to their office; and yet our Saviour, being by his humiliation in the character of a private Person, never questioned it, no not when he was upbraided, as if he had answered *G O D's* High Priest irreverently, which looks like a case of Confession. And *S. Paul* did the same. Now as to what is said of the High Priests being a Civil Magistrate, it will not serve to deliver you; for his title to the Civil Power flowed from his office: therefore the owning him in that, did also acknowledge his office, since he had no other right to the Civil Power, but because he was High Priest, and yet subjection was given him by our *L O R D*, who acknowledged the High Priest. Did he not also continue in the Temple Worship, and go thither on their festivities? where you know he must have offered Sacrifices by the hands of these Priests: and yet we know well enough what a sort of People they were. If then we are no less bound under the Gospel to the rules of Order and Unity, than they were under the
Law,

Law, it will follow that no personal corruption of Church-men, can warrant a separation from Worship, even though their Opinions were erroneous, and their practices naughty: for the impertinency of the distinction of *Non-compliance* and *separation* was already proved. But next to the Temple-worship, was the service of the *Synagogue*, which was for the most part in the hands of the *Scribes* and *Pharisees*, who expounded the Law to the people: And *Christ's* commanding the people to *observe what they taught*, shews clearly his pleasure was, that they should not forsake the *Synagogues* where they taught: And his own going to the *Synagogues*, in which it is not to be doubted but he concurred in the *Prayers* and *Hymns*, proves abundantly that their Worship was not to be separated from. As for your Friends involved discourse, about the declining of Churches, *Pag. 193.* I must let it alone, till I can make sense of it: For if he intend to compare our *Lord* and his Apostles, their joining in the *Jewish Worship*, with the misguided, though sincere devotion, of some holy Souls who worshipped God with all the corruptions of the *Roman Church*, I hope he will repent the blasphemy of such a mistake. And as for what is alledged, *Pag. 198.* that the *Jewish Dispensation* being mixed, and their Law made up of *matters Political*, as well as

S

Spiri-

Spiritual, therefore these *Scribes* were the Oracles of the *Civil Law*, and so to be gone to, it is as weak as the rest: For the Law being to be *sought from the Priests lips*, as to all the parts of it, any power the Priests had of pronouncing about the questions of the Law, was because they were Priests, or as they were men separated for officiating in the *Synagogues*: so the receiving their decisions in *matters judicial*, did acknowledg their Office, which was purely *Ecclesiastical and sacred*.

From all this I may infer, that as long as any *Society* continues to be the Church and people of *G O D*, and hath the service and worship of *G O D* performed in it by men solemnly separated, according to *G O D*'s appointment, whatever irregularities be either in their entry to such charges, or of their opinions or practices, these should indeed be cognosced upon, and censured by the *Supreme Powers in the Society*; but will never warrant private persons to separate from the Worship, unless it be so vitiated in any part of it, that without sin they cannot concur in it: in which case, they are indeed to keep themselves clean, and to withdraw, but not to divide until the Worship be so corrupted, that the ends of publick Worship can no more be answered by such *Assemblies*.

Poly. I know it is thought a piece of noble gallan-

gallantry among our new modelled people, to despise the sentiments of the *Ancient Church*; and therefore whatever I could adduce from them, would prevail little for their conviction: otherwise many things could be brought to this purpose from these two great Assertors of the Unity of the Church against Schisms and Divisions, S. Cyprian, and S. Augustin: the latter especially, who by many large Treatises studied the conviction of the *Donatists*, who maintained their separation from the Church, much upon the same grounds which are by your Friends asserted. But I shall dismiss this point with one Sentence of S. Augustin, lib: 2. contra Parmen. *Quisquis ergo vel quod potest arguendo corrigit; vel quod corrigere non potest, salvo pacis vinculo excludit, vel quod salvo pacis vinculo excludere non potest, equitate improbat, firmitate supportat, hic est pacificus.* And let me freely tell you, that when I consider the temper, the untractableness, the peevish complainings, the railings, the high cantings of the *Donatists*, which are set down by him, and others, I am sometimes made to think I am reading things that are now among our selves, and not what passed twelve Ages ago. And indeed some late practices make the parallel run more exactly betwixt our modern Zealots and the *Circumcellions*, who were a Sect of the *Donatists*, that was acted by a black and a

most desperate spirit. For *St. Augustin* tells us, how they fell on these who adhered to the *Unity of the Church*, beating some with Cudgels, putting out the Eyes of others, and invading the lives of some, particularly of *Maximinus* Bishop of *Hagaia*, whom they left several times for dead. And what instances of this nature these few years have produced, all the Nation knows. How many of the Ministers have been invaded in their Houses, their Houses rifled, their goods carried away, themselves cruelly beaten and wounded, and often made to swear to abandon their Churches, and that they should not so much as complain of such bad usage to these in Authority: their Wives also scaped not the fury of these accursed Zealots, but were beaten and wounded, some of them being scarce recovered out of their labor in Child-birth. Believe me, these barbarous outrages have been such, that worse could not have been apprehended from *Heathens*. And if after these, I should recount the Railings, Scoffings and floutings which the *Conformable Ministers* meet with to their Faces, even on streets, and publick High-ways, not to mention the contempt is poured on them more privately, I would be looked on as a forger of extravagant Stories. But it is well I am talking to men who know them as well as my self. From these things I may well assume that the persecution

cution lies mainly on the *Conformists* side, who for their Obedience to the Laws, lie thus open to the fury of their Enemies.

Isot. Now, I dare say, you speak against your conscience: For do you think any of the *L O R D's* people have accession to so much wickedness, which is abhorred by them all: and this is well enough known to you, though you seem to disguise it. For you have often heard our honest Ministers express their horror at such practices; do not therefore *sin against the generation of the Lord's Children* so far, as to charge the guilt of some murdering Rogues, upon these who would be very glad to see Justice done upon such Villains.

Phil. You say very fair, and I am glad to hear you condemning these Crimes so directly: and I am as desirous as any living can be, to be furnished with clear evidences of believing as much good as is possible of all mankind. But let me tell you plainly, that the constant concealing of these murderers, whom no search which those in Authority have caused to make, could discover, tho the Robbers carried with them often a great deal of furniture, and other goods, which must have been conveyed to some adjacent Houses, but could never be found out, after so many repeated facts of that nature, forceth upon the most charitable, a suspicion which I

love not to name. Next, let me tell you that these things are very justifiable from the principles your Friends go upon: for if we be by Oath bound to discover all Malignants or evil instruments, that they may be brought to condign punishment; and if our *Conformity* be so notorious a wickedness, and such a plain breach of Covenant, in the punishment whereof the Magistrate is supine and backward, then let every one compare the doctrine of the late Pamphlets, *from p. 282. to p. 408. chiefly 404. and 405.* and declare whether by the Rules laid down in them, any private persons upon heroical excitations may not execute vengeance on these who are so guilty of gross and notorious backsliding and defection: and what may not be expected of this nature from him *who hesitates to call the invading of the Bishop with a Pistol, an accursed act;* and will only condemn it, *as rash, precipitant; and of evil example:* and that not simply neither, *but all circumstances being considered, and their exigencies duly ballanced?* Which makes me apprehend his greatest quarrel with that deed was; that it missed the designed effect, and so was done inadvertently, or too publicly, or upon some such particular ground, which may have occasioned its miscarriage. But to deal roundly with you, I shall freely acknowledg, if the Doctrine of Resistance by private Subjects against these in

Authority

Authority be lawful, I see no ground to condemn such practices : For if we may rise in Arms against those in Authority over us, and coerce and punish them ; why not much rather against our fellow Subjects, and those to whom we owe no obedience, especially when we judge them to have transgressed so signally, and to have injured us to a high degree ? which is the case, as most of you state it, with the Ministers that are conformable. And from this, let me take the freedom to tell you, that the whole *Mystery of Jesuitism* doth not discover a principle more destructive of the peace and order of mankind, than this doctrine of the lawfulness of private persons executing vengeance on gross offenders, where the transgression is judged signal, the Magistrate is judged remiss, and the actors pretend an heroick excitation. This puts a Sword in a mad mans hands, and arms the whole multitude, and is worse than theirs, who will have such deeds warranted by some supreme *Ecclesiastical Power*, or at least by a *Confessarius* and *Director* of the *Conscience*. Indeed this may justly possess the minds of all that hear it with horror, it being a direct contradiction of the *Moral Law*, and an overturning of all the *Societies* of Mankind, and *Laws* of Nature.

End. I am more charitable than you are: for though I must acknowledg what you have
S 4 alledg-

alledged to be the native consequence of what is asserted in that Book, yet I am inclined to believe he intended not these things should be drawn from it, since he in plain terms, *pag. 402.* condemns these outrages. I confess, his zeal to defend all *Naphthali* laid, and to refute every thing the *Conformist* alledged, hath engaged him further than himself could upon second thoughts allow of. And as for the instances of *Phinebas*, *Elijah*, or other Prophets, the argument from them was so fully obviated in our *First Conference*, that I am confident little weight will be laid upon it. But now, methinks, it is more than time we considered the importance of that difference about which all this ado is made: for one would expect it must be a very concerning matter, which hath occasioned so much bloud and confusion, and continues still to divide us asunder, with so much heat and bitterness. I confess, my discerning is weak, which keeps me from apprehending what importance can be in it to exact so much zeal for it, that it should be called the *Kingdom of CHRIST* upon Earth, his Interest, Cause, and Work, which therefore should be earnestly contended for.

Isot. The natural man receiveth not the things of GOD, and they are foolishness to him: but Wisdom is justified of all her children. That we plead for,

is *CHRIST's Kingdom*, which is in opposition both to the proud aspirings of the *Prelates*, and to the violent invasions of the *Civil Powers*: We are therefore on *CHRIST's* side, asserting that none in earth can institute new Officers in his House, but those he hath appointed: and that he hath appointed none higher than ordinary preaching *Presbyters*, among whom he will have an equality observed: which whosoever contradict, with *Diotrephes*, *they love the preeminence*, and *Lord it over GOD's inheritance*.

Phil. Though I will not fly so high with my pretensions in big words, yet the issue of our Discourse will declare if I have not better grounds to assert *Episcopacy* to have descended from the Apostles, and Apostolical times, into all the Ages and corners of the Church who received it: and that there is nothing in Scripture that contradicts such an *Institution*. But I shall refer the decision of this to all impartial minds.

Basil. Truly, when without a particular Examination, I consider the whole matter in general, I can see little to except against *Episcopal Government*, that I cannot avoid the severe thoughts of suspecting the great aversion many have at it, to be occasioned from the *spirit of contradiction* is in many *which lusteth to envy*, or from their opposition to these in Authority: For I doubt not
but

but if *Presbytery* had the same countenance from the Laws, it should meet with the same contradiction from these who seem to adhere to no principle so firmly, as to their *resisting the Powers that are ordained of G O D*. But the handling of this, with that fulness and clearness which the noise made about it requires, will take up more of our time than we can be now Masters of, and may well claim a new *Conference*: Therefore we shall remit any further discourse about it to our next meeting.

Isot. It is agreed to: and I shall let you see, that for all the Railings of these days Discourse, my patience is yet strong enough to allow of another interview, though I confess my self weary of so much bad Company, whose evil Communications are designed to corrupt my good Principles.

Phil. I confess, my weariness is as great as yours, though upon a very different account: For I am surfeited of the Contention and heat hath been among us, and long for an end of our *Conferences* upon these Heads, which I shall now go through once for all, being encouraged to meet with you again, because this penance is near an end: out of which if I were once extricated, I am resolved to meddle in such contentious Themes no more.

Eud. Having swallowed the Ox, we must not stick on the Rump. It is true, your Converse is extremely agreeable, yet my stomach begins to turn at so much disputing: But, I hope, to morrow shall put an end to it: And therefore I doubt not of your return, to finish what you hitherto carried on. And so a good night to you.

THE

THE FOURTH CONFERENCE.

Isotimus.

I COME now upon our last Nights appointment, to pursue this *Conference* to its end, and to examine what these grounds are which endear *Episcopacy* to you so much, especially considering the great disorders and confusions its re-establishment among us hath occasioned. For my part, I cannot see what can reconcile the World to it, much less what should enamour you so of it, as to make you adhere to it, notwithstanding all the evils spring from it, and all these black Characters of *GOD*'s displeasure are upon it: which really appear so signally to me, that it seems a fighting against *GOD*, to adhere longer to it.

Phil. Truly, you and I enter on this Subject with an equal surprize, though upon very differ-

different accounts: For I must tell you freely, that after I have with all the application of mind, and freedom of thoughts imaginable, considered what could engage so many in this *Island*, into so much zeal and rage against the Order, I am not able to satisfy myself about it. That venerable Order having such a native tendency for advancing of true Religion, Peace, Order, and every thing that is excellent: that the aversion and prejudices so many have drunk in against it, seem as unjust, as unconquerable, and look like a part of *G O D*'s controversie with us; whereby we are blindly carried into so much unjustifiable zeal against that, which if well managed, might prove an excellent mean for reviving the power of Religion, that hath suffered so great decays. I shall not deny, but on our part there have been great failings, for which *G O D*'s anger hangs over our heads: and that he permits all this opposition we meet with for punishing us for our sins, which have justly provoked *G O D* to make us *base and contemptible in the sight of the people*. And this I hope shall be an effectual mean of humbling us, and of purging us from our dross: whereby this holy Order being again managed with the ancient Spirit, may appear into the World in its *Primitive lustre*; and be attended with the blessings that then followed it, to the wonder

wonder and conviction of all men. But let me add, the opposition some fiery spirits have given the establishment of *Episcopacy*, deserves much of the blame of its being so little successful in the great work of the Gospel: for always *bitter envy and strife produce confusion and every evil work*: therefore when you are to view *Episcopacy* in its amiable and lovely colors, let me send you back to that *cloud of witnesses*, who for the *testimony of JESUS* endured all manner of torments, were torn by beasts, slain by the sword, burnt in the fire; and in a word, who preached the everlasting Gospel through the World. How many Churches did these Bishops found with their labors in preaching, and water not only with their tears, but their blood? how sublime was their piety? how frevent were their Sermons? how constant were their labors? how strict was their discipline? how zealous were they against heresies? and how watchful against vice? In a word, read but the Histories and Writings of those *great Worthies*, who were by the confession of all men, *Bishops*, and had more absolute Authority over the *Inferior Clergy*, than is pretended to among us? and then tell me, if you have not changed your verdict of that order. Have there been such men in the Christian World, as were *Ignatius, Polycarp, Irenæus, Cyprian, Thaumaturg, Athanasius, Basil,*

Basil, Nazianzen, Martin, Ambrose, Chrysostome, Augustin, and a thousand more? These were, after the Apostles, the greatest glories of the Christian Church: and were *burning and shining lights*. It is in their lives, writings and decrees, that I desire you to view Episcopacy: and if it have any way fallen from that first and fair Original, direct your thoughts and zeal to contrive and carry on its recovery to its former purity and fervor: but take it not at the disadvantage, as it may have suffered any thing from the corruptions of men, in a succession of so many ages; for you know the Sacraments, the Ministry, and all the parts of Religion have been soiled, and stained of their first beauty by their corrupt hands, to whose care they were committed. But he were very much to blame, who would thereupon quarrel these things. I shall therefore intreat you will consider that Order, either in it self, or as it flourished in the first ages of the Church, and not as prejudices or particular escapes may have represented it to you.

End. That you may both understand one another better, let me suggest to you the right stating of that you differ about, that you be not contending about words, or notions of things, which may appear with various shapes, and faces; one whereof may be amiable, and another
ugly

ugly: give therefore a clear and distinct account of that *Episcopacy* you own and assert.

Poly. Since *Philarcheus* hath appealed to the ancient Church, for the true pattern of *Episcopacy*, I shall faithfully represent to you, what the office and power of their Bishops was, and how it took its first rise and growth among them; and then I shall leave it to be discussed, how lawful or allowable it is of it self. The *Jews* had among them, beside the *Temple-worship*, which was *Typical*, their *Synagogues*, not only over the land, but through all the corners of the World into which they were dispersed; which were called their *Prosenchæ* among the *Greeks*, and *Romans*. Thither did they meet for the dayly worship of *G O D*; there did they likewise meet on their Sabbaths, and recited their *Philacteries*, or *Liturgies*, and heard a portion of the Law read: which was divided in so many Sections, that it might be yearly read over: there was also a word of exhortation used, after the Law was read: and there were in these Synagogues, Office-Bearers separated for that work, who were to order the Worship, and the reading of the Law, and were to censure sins, by several degrees of *Excommunications*, casting them out of the *Synagogue*: they were likewise to see to the supplying the necessities of the Poor. Now if we consider the practice of our
Saviour

Saviour, and his Apostles, we shall find them studying to comply with the forms received among the *Jews*, as much as was possible, or consistent with the new Dispensation; which might be instanced in many particulars, as in both Sacraments, the forms of Worship, the practice of Excommunication, and these might be branched out into many instances. And indeed since we find the Apostles yielding so far in compliance with the *Jews* about the *Mosaical Rites*, which were purely typical, and consequently antiquated by the death of *CHRIST*, we have a great deal of more reason to apprehend they complied with their forms in things that were not typical, but rather moral, such as was the order of their Worship: these things only excepted, wherein the Christian Religion required a change to be made: And this the rather, that wherever they went promulgating the Gospel, the first offer of it was made to the *Jews*; many of whom believed, but were still *zealous of the Traditions of their Fathers*. And so it is not like, that they who could not be prevailed upon to part with the *Mosaical Rites*, for all the reasons were offered against them, were so easily content to change their other forms, which were of themselves useful and innocent. Now since we see the Apostles retained, and improved so many of their Rites and

T

Customs,

customs, why they should have innovated the Government of their Synagogues, will not be easily made clear: especially since they retained the names of *Bishop*, *Presbyter*, and *Deacon*, which were in use among the *Jews*, and since they did bless and separate them by the imposition of hands, which had been also practised among the *Jews*: and all this will appear with a clearer visage of reason, if we consider the accounts given in the *Acts*, or rules prescribed in the *Epistles of the Apostles*, about the framing and constituting their Churches. All which speak out nothing of a new Constitution, but tell only what rules they gave for regulating things; which from the stile they run in, seem to have been then constituted: and is very far either from *Moses's* Language in the *Pentateuch*, or from the forms of the Institution of the Sacraments: And except the little we have of the Institution of Deacons, nothing like an Institution occurs in the *New Testament*; and yet that seems not the Institution of an Order, but a particular provision of men for serving the *Hellenists* in an office already known, and received. Now let me here send you to the Masters of the *Jewish* learning, particularly to the eminently learned, and judicious *Doctor Lightfoot*, who will inform you, that in every Synagogue there was one peculiarly charged with the Worship

ship, called the *Bishop of the Congregation, the Angel of the Church, or the Minister of the Synagogue*: and besides him, there were three, who had the Civil Judicatory; who judged also about the receiving Proselytes, the imposition of hands, &c. And there were other three, who gathered, and distributed the almes. Now the Christian Religion taking place, as the Gospel was planted in the Cities, where it was chiefly preached, these forms and orders were retained, both name and thing: for we cannot think that the Apostles, whose chief work was the gaining of Souls from *Gentilism* or *Judaism*, were very solicitous about modes of Government; but took things as they found them. Only the Elder and greater Christians they separated for Church Offices, and retained an inspection over them themselves. And abstracting from what was said about the *Synagogues*, it is natural to think, that when the Apostles left them, and died, they did appoint the more eminent to be Over-seers to the rest; which why not every where, as well as was done by *S. Paul* to *Timothy* and *Titus*, is not easily to be proved. But this is yet more rational from what was premised about the *Synagogue* Pattern; only they did not restrict themselves to that number, for the number of the *Presbyters* was indefinite; but the *Deacons* were accord-

ing to their first original, restricted to the number seven. Thus the first form was, that there was one whose charge it was to over-see, feed, and rule the flock: and where the number of the Christians was small, they met all in one place for Worship, and it was easie for the *Bishop* to overtake the charge. But for the spreading of the Gospel, he had about him a company of the elder, and more eminent Christians, who were designed and ordained for diffusing the Gospel through the Cities, Villages, and Places adjacent: and these *Presbyters* were as the Bishop's Children educated, and formed by him, being in all they did, directed by him, and accountable to him, and were as Probationers for the Bishoprick: one of them being always chosen to succeed in the seat when vacant through the Bishop's death. Now all these lived together, as in a little *College*, and were maintained out of the charitable Oblations of the People, which were deposited in the Bishop's hands, and divided in four parts; one falling to the Bishop, another to the Clergy, a third to the Widows and Orphans, and other poor Persons, and a fourth to the building of edifices for Worship. Thus the Churches were planted, and the Gospel was disseminated through the World. But at first every Bishop had but one Parish, yet afterwards when the numbers of the Christians

encrea-

increased, that they could not conveniently meet in one place; and when through the violence of the Persecutions they durst not assemble in great multitudes, the Bishops divided their charges in lesser Parishes, and gave assignments to the *Presbyters* of particular flocks, which was done first in *Rome*, in the beginning of the Second Century: and these Churches assigned to *Presbyters*, as they received the Gospel from the Bishop, so they owned a dependence on him as their Father, who was also making frequent excursions to them, and visiting the whole bounds of his Precinct. And things continued thus in a *Parochial Government*, till toward the end of the Second Century, the Bishop being chiefly entrusted with the cure of Souls, a share whereof was also committed to the *Presbyters*, who were subject to him, and particularly were to be ordained by him; nor could any Ordination be without the Bishop; who in ordaining, was to carry along with him the concurrence of the *Presbyters*, as in every other act of *Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction*. But I run not out into more particulars, because of an account of all these things which I have drawn with an unbiass'd ingenuity, and as much diligence as was possible for me to bring along with me to so laborious a work: and this I shall send you when our Conference shall be at an end. But in the end of the Second

Century, the Churches were framed in another mould from the division of the *Empire*: and the *Bishops* of the Cities did, according to the several divisions of the *Empire*, associate in *Synods* with the chief *Bishop* of that *Division* or *Province*, who was called the *Metropolitan*, from the dignity of the City where he was *Bishop*. And hence sprang *Provincial Synods*, and the *Superiorities*, and *Precedencies* of *Bishopricks*, which were ratified in the Council of *Nice*, as ancient *Customs*, they being at that time above an hundred years old. * In the beginning of the Third Century, as the purity of Churchmen begun to abate, so new methods were devised for preparing them well to those sacred Functions, and therefore they were appointed to pass through several degrees before they could be *Deacons*, *Presbyters*, or *Bishops*. And the Orders of *Porters*, *Readers*, *Singers*, *Exorcists* (or *Catechists*) *Acolyths* (who were to be the *Bishops* attendants) and *Subdeacons*, were set up; of whom mention is made first by *Cyprian*: and these degrees were so many steps of probationership to the supreme Order. But all this was not able to keep out the corruptions were breaking in upon Church Officers, especially after the Fourth Century, that the *Empire* became Christian: which as it brought much riches and splendor on Church Employments, so it let in great swarms of

cor-

corrupt men on the Christian Assemblies: And then the election to Church Offices, which was formerly in the hands of the people, was taken from them, by reason of the tumults and disorders were in these elections: which sometimes ended in blood, and occasioned much faction, and schism. And *Ambitus* became now such an universal sin among Churchmen, that in that Century, *Monasteries* were founded in divers places by holy Bishops, as by *Basile*, *Augustine*, *Martin*, and others; who imitated the Example of those in *Egypt*, and *Nutria*; whose design was the purifying of these who were to serve in the Gospel. It is true, these Semina-ries did also degenerate, and become nests of superstition and idleness: yet it cannot be denied, but this was an excellent Constitution, for rightly forming the minds of the designers for holy Orders; that being trained up in a course of Devotion, Fasting, Solitude, abstraction from the World, and Poverty, they might be better qualified for the discharge of that holy Function. And thus I have given you a general draught and perspective of the first Constitution of Churches, together with some steps of their advances, and declinings: But I despair not to give you an ampler account, and plan of their rules and forms. Mean while, let this suffice.

Phil. From what you have told us, I shall propose the notion I have of *Episcopacy*, that the work of a *Bishop*, as it is chiefly to feed the flock, so it is more particularly to form, educate, and try these who are to be admitted to *Church Employments*; and to over-see, direct, admonish, and reprove these who are already settled in *Church Offices*: so that as the chief tryal of those who are to be ordained, is his work, the Ordinations ought to be performed by him; yet not so as to exclude the assistance and concurrence of *Presbyters*, both in the previous tryal, and in the Ordination it self. But on the other hand, no Ordination ought to be without the *Bishop*. And as for Jurisdiction, though the *Bishop* hath authority to over-see, reprove, and admonish the Clergy; yet in all acts of publick Jurisdiction, as he ought not to proceed without their concurrence, so neither ought they without his knowledge and allowance, determine about *Ecclesiastical matters*. As for the notion of the distinct Offices of *Bishop* and *Presbyter*, I confess, it is not so clear to me: and therefore since I look upon the sacramental Actions, as the highest of sacred Performances; I cannot but acknowledge these who are empowered for them, must be of the highest Office in the Church. So I do not alledge a *Bishop* to be a distinct Office from a *Presbyter*; but a different degree

degree in the same Office, to whom for order and unities sake, the chief inspection and care of *Ecclesiastical Matters* ought to be referred, and who shall have authority to curb the Insolencies of some factious and turbulent Spirits. His work should be to feed the flock by the Word and Sacraments, as well as other *Presbyters*; and especially to try and ordain Entrants, and to over-see, direct, and admonish such as bear Office. And I the more willingly incline to believe *Bishops* and *Presbyters*, to be the several degrees of the same Office, since the names of *Bishop* and *Presbyter*, are used for the same thing in Scripture; and are also used promiscuously by the Writers of the two first *Centuries*. Now *Isotimus*, when you bring either clear Scripture, or evident Reason, for proving this to be unlawful, or unexpedient, you shall shake my kindness to this Constitution, whose venerable Antiquity hath conciliated so much reverence from me to it, that it will be a great attempt to change my value of it.

Isot. These are all brave Stories well contrived for triumphing among ignorants. But these pretences from Antiquity have been so baffled by the learned Assertors of *Presbyterial Government*, that I wonder how you can so confidently vouch them, since there is not a vestige of any disparity before the 140th year after
Christ

C H R I S T. And we know the *Mystery of Iniquity* wrought in the days of the Apostles, and that then there was a *Diotrophes who loved the preeminence*, and the darkness and obscurity of the rise and progress of *Prelacy*, doth the more confirm me, that it was the *Mystery of Iniquity*. The pretence from *Ignatius's* Epistles, hath been often overthrown; and there are words in these Epistles which clearly prove them to be the contrivance of some Impostor, they being so inconsistent with the strain of Religion, and truth of the Gospel, not to speak of the Orthodoxy and Piety of *Ignatius*, and the simplicity of these times, which demonstrate their interpolation evidently, for all the pains *Doctor Hamond* hath been at to assert their faith: and therefore these can furnish you with no argument. See pag. 145. and 151.

Poly. I confess I can hear you tell over the arguments of these Pamphlets with some patience: But truly in this instance, I know not how to treat you, or rather him in whose name you speak, who yet would earnestly perswade the World of the great skill, he and his friends have in these things. Surely they are *the men of Wisdom!* And one may as securely pull the hairs out of a Lion's beard, as twit them with the least degree of ignorance. But, pray, tell your *Learned Friend*, that in his next publick
appear-

appearance, he meddle no more with Antiquity before he know it better, and discover not so much ignorance, that one of a months standing in that study may laugh at him.

Pray, *Sir*, are you in earnest, when you tell me that for 140 years after *CHRIST*, there is no vestige of Prelacy on record? Will you not believe *Irenæus*, who lived at that time, though he wrote some years after, and reckons the succession of the Bishops of *Rome* from the days of the Apostles? Or if the Writings and Records of that time be lost, will you give no credit in a Historical matter to those who followed that time, and drew their accounts from Writings then extant, though now lost, such as *Tertullian*, *Cyprian*, but especially *Eusebius*, who gives the succession of the Bishops, in the several great Sees, from the Apostles days? Certainly, he who was born but about an hundred years after the time you mark, would have had some knowledge of so great a change. But if there was no vestige of *Prelacy* before the year 140 in which it first appeared, what time will you allow for its spreading through the World? Or was it in an instant received every where? Were all the pretenders so easily enflamed to this *Paroxysm* of Ambition? And were all the other *Presbyters* so tame, as to be so easily wheeled out of their rights, without one protestation
on

on the contrary? How came the Eclipse of the Church to a total Obscuration in one minute? What charm was there in *Prelacy* at that time, that the World was so enchanted with it; and that so soon after S. *John's* death, when *Polycarp*, and many more of the Apostolical men did yet survive? And how came it, that all the Churches did so unanimously concur in the defection, and not so much as two witnesses appeared to fight against this Beast? Let me tell you freely, there is not a ravery in *Don Quixot's Adventures*, or *Amadis de Gaul*, but is liker to prevail on my belief, than this *Romance*. But for *Ignatius's* Epistles, the hazard of the issue of the debate about them is very unequal: for if these Epistles be his, then he dying so near S. *John's* days, the Cause of *Presbytery* will be undone. But though they be not his, the Episcopal Party sustain small prejudice: For from other traces of Antiquity, it can be made as clear, that *Episcopacy* was in the Church from the days of the Apostles, as any historical thing which is at so great distance from our time. But for your friends exceptions at these Epistles, they betray his great skill, and tell clearly, that he understands not the question, and that he hath never read a Page of *Doctor Hamond*, though with his usual arrogance, he flights all he saith: For had he read any part of his differ-

dissertation, he would have made a difference betwixt the old vulgar Edition of these Epistles, whose Interpolations that learned *Doctor* acknowledgeth, and the late Edition of them by the learned *Vossius*, according to the *Medicean Codex*, whose authority he only voucheth. Now had he known this, would he have cited words out of them, which are not of the true Edition asserted by *Doctor Hammond*, but are of the old vulgar and rejected one? Certainly, had he read any thing of that debate, which hath been truly managed with much subtil critical learning on both sides, he could not have stumbled unto such a mistake. But his reading, it is like, riseth not above Pamphlets; and finding these words cited on the same design, before the late Editions of *Ignatius* came out; he, without examining, took them upon trust from second hand. But I shall not run out farther upon *Ignatius's* Epistles, than to recommend their perusal to you, and then I am confident you will discern such a native, simple, and sincerely pious, and devout strain in them, so unlike the swelled Stile, or purposes of interpolated Writings, that they will be their own testimony for convincing you of their genuineness: but the exceptions against them being so fully, and so lately, with an amazing diligence, answered by *Doctor Pearson*, I shall remit you to his Labors, if you intend

intend to examine this matter accurately.

Iſot. Your *Conformiſt* did likewise alledge the 40; but he ſhould have ſaid the 38 *Apoſtolicall Canon*, with a hint, as if fifty of theſe might have been the Apoſtles appointments: though the heap of them is ſo full of novelties, that their Antiquity cannot be pleaded by any who knows the ſtate of the ancient Church; as appears from the 3, 17, and 25 Canons: and were theſe Canons received, they would prejudice more than advance the cauſe you maintain, as will appear from the 4, 33, 36, and 80 Canons, not to mention the 24, 26, 28, 41, 53, 57, and 75. And in a word, theſe Canons do only allow of a precedency of Order, but not of your Prelatick power and ſuperiority, that claims the ſole power of Ordination and Jurisdiction: See pag. 148.

Poly. Truly, Sir, if the former exceptions did prove your Author a ſecond hand writer, who voucheth Antiquity upon the teſtimony of others, this doth it much more. For I am ſure had he but read over thoſe Canons, which might be done in half an hour, he had argued this point at another rate: and had he ſeen the Edition of *Dionyſius Exiguus*, he had not accuſed the *Conformiſt* for citing that Canon, as the fortieth, ſince it is ſo in his diviſion, who was their firſt publiſher in the *Latine Church*, tho it be the thirty ninth in the *Greek* diviſion. But

I will deal roundly in this matter, and acknowledge that collection to be none of the Apostles nor *Clement's*, since all that passed under *Clement's* name was accounted spurious, except his first Epistle to the *Corinthians*. Nor was this a production of the first two ages. For the silence of the Writers of those *Centuries* gives clear evidence for their novelty: They not being cited for the decision of things then in controversy, wherein they are express, as in the matter of *Easter*, the *rebaptizing Hereticks*, and divers other particulars. Yet in the Fourth and Fifth *Century*, reference is after made to some Elders rules of the Church, which are to be found nowhere but in this Collection. The Apostolical Canons are also sometimes expressly mentioned: and this gives good ground to believe there were from the Third *Century* and forward, some rules general received in the Church, and held Apostolical, as being at first introduced by Apostolical men. This was at first learnedly made out by *De Marca Concord. lib. 3. c. 2.* and of late more fully by that most ingenious and accurate searcher into Antiquity *Beveregius* in his Preface to his *Annotations* on these Canons. Yet I am apt to think, they were only preserv'd by an *oral tradition*: and that no collection of them was agreed on, and publish'd before the fifth *Century*. It is certain, the *Latine Church* in Pope *Inno-*

Innocent's days acknowledged no Canons but those of *Nice*. And many of the Canons in this Collection, we find among Canons of other Councils, particularly in that of *Antioch*; without any reference to a preceding authority that had enjoined them: which we can hardly think they had omitted, had they received the collection (I speak of) as Apostolical. And that of the *triple immersion in Baptism*, looks like a Rule, no elder than the *Arrian Controversie*. They began first to appear under the name of the Apostles Canons in the Fifth Century, which made *Pope Gelasius* with a Synod of seventy Bishops condemn them as Apocryphal; though I must add, that the authority of that pretended Council and Decree, though generally received, be on many accounts justly questionable: And yet by this we are only to understand, that he rejected that pretended authority of the Apostles prefixed to these Canons. In the beginning of the Sixth Century they were published by *Dionysius Exiguus*, who prefixed fifty of them to his translation of the *Greek Canons*; but he confesses they were much doubted by many. At the same time they were published in the *Greek Church* with the addition of thirty five more Canons, and were acknowledged generally. *Justinian* cites them often in the *Novels*, and in the sixth *Novel* calls them, the Canons

nons of the holy Apostles, kept and interpreted by the Fathers. And the same authority was ascribed to them by the Council in *Trullo*. These things had been pertinently alledged if you had known them, but for your Friends nibblings at them, if you will but give your self the trouble of reading these Canons, you will be ashamed of his weakness, who manageth his advantage so ill. And to instance this but in one particular, had he read these Canons himself, could he have cited the eighty which is among the latter additions, and passed by the sixth, which is full to the same purpose? But for that impudent allegation,, as if a bare precedency had been only ascribed to Bishops by these Canons, look but on the 14. the 30. 37. 40. 54. and 73. and then pass your verdict on your Friends ingenuity, or his knowledg. By the 14. *No Churchman may pass from one Parish to another without his Bishop's sentence, otherwise he is suspended from Ecclesiastical Functions: and if he refuse to return, when required by his Bishop, he is to be accounted a Churchman no more.* By the 30. *A Presbyter, who in contempt of his Bishop gathers a Congregation apart, having nothing to condemn his Bishop of, either as being unholy or unjust, he is to be deposed, as one that is ambitious, and tyrannous; and such of the Clergy or Laity as join with them, are likewise to be censured.* By the 37. *The Bishop*

hath the care of all Church matters, which he must administrate as in the sight of God. By the 39. The Bishop hath power over all the goods of the Church; and the reason given is, that since the precious souls of men are committed to him, it is much more just he have the charge of the goods of the Church. By the 54. If a Clergy-man reproach their Bishop, he is to be deposed, for it is written, Thou shalt not curse the Ruler of thy people. And by the 73. A Bishop, when accused, is only to be judged of by other Bishops. Now from these hints, judg whether there be truth in that Assertion, that only a precedence is asserted in these Canons: and if all the power is now pleaded for, be not there held out; not to mention the Canon was cited by the *Conformist*, that Presbyters or Deacons might finish nothing without the Bishop's Sentence, since the Souls of the people are trusted to him. As for the sole power of Ordination and Jurisdiction, I am sure none among us do claim it, but willingly allow the Presbyters a concurrence in both these. And as to what your friend saith of *Cyprian*, it is of a piece with the learning and ingenuity that runneth through the rest of his Discourse, from page 150 to page 160. where for divers pages he belabours his Reader with brave shews of Learning and high invention, so that no doubt he thinks he hath performed Wonders, and fully satisfied every scruple

con-

concerning the rise and progress of Episcopacy.

Isot. I pray you, do not fly too high, and make not too much ado about any small advantages you conceive you have of my Friend: but upon the whole matter I am willing to believe there was a precedency pretty early begun in the Church, which I shall not deny was useful and innocent, tho a deviation from the first pattern: Neither shall I deny, that holy men were of that Order: but when it is considered what a step even that Precedency was to Lordly Prelacy, and how from that the *son of perdition* rose up to his pretence of Supremacy; we are taught how unsafe it is to change any thing in the Church, from the first institution of its blessed Head, who knew best what was fit for it, according to whose will all things in it should be managed.

Poly. It hath been often repeated, that nothing was ever so sacred, as to escape that to which all things, when they fall in the hands of Mortals, are obnoxious. And may not one that quarrels a standing Ministry, argue on the same grounds, a Ministers authority over the people, gave the rise to the authority Bishops pretend over Ministers, and so the Ministry will be concluded the first step of the Beast's Throne? Or may not the authority your Judi-

catories pretend to be at the same rate struck out, since from lesser Synods sprung greater ones, from Provincial rose Generals, and from these Oecumenical ones with the pretence of infallibility? But to come nearer you, that whole frame of *Metropolitans* and *Patriarchs* was taken from the division of the *Roman Empire*, which made up but one great National Church: and so no wonder the Bishop of the Imperial City of that *Empire*, was the *Metropolitan* of that Church: yet he was not all that neither, since he had no authority over his fellow *Patriarchs*, being only the first in order, which truly were the Bishops of that Church: what they were for the first four Ages, it was never judged an absurdity to grant to them still: tho the ruin of the *Roman Empire*, and its division into so many Kingdoms, which are constituted in various National Churches, do alter the present frame of *Europe* so entirely, from what was then; that with very good reason what was then submitted to, on the account of the Unity of the *Empire*, may be now undone by reason of the several Kingdoms, which are National Churches within themselves; and need not to own so much as the acknowledgment of Primacy to any, but to the *Metropolitan* of their own Kingdom. And it seems the interest of Princes, as well as Churches, to assert this. But for the pretence of the Pope's supremacy

macy, *Episcopacy* was so far from being judged a step to it, that the ruin of the *Episcopal* authority over *Presbyters*, and the granting them exemptions from the Jurisdiction of their Ordinary, was the greatest advance the *Roman Bishop* ever made in his tyrannical usurpation over Churches. I need not here tell so known a matter, as is that of the *exemption of the Regulars*, who being subject to their own Superiors and Generals, and by them to the Pope, were sent through the World in swarms; and with great shews of piety, devotion, and poverty, carried away all the esteem and following from the secular Clergy; who were indeed become too secular, and these were the Pope's *Agents* and *Emissaries*, who brought the World to receive the *mark of the Beast*, and wonder at her. For before that time, the Popes found more difficulty to carry on their pretensions, both from secular Princes and Bishops: But these Regulars being warranted to preach and administer the Sacraments without the Bishop's license, or being subject and accountable to him; as they brought the Bishops under great contempt, so they were the Pope's chief confidants in all their treasonable plots against the Princes of *Europe*. And when at the *Council of Trent*, the Bishops of *Spain* being weary of the insolencies of the Regulars, and of the Papal yolk, designed to get

free from it. The great mean they proposed, was to get *Episcopacy* declared to be of *divine Right*, which would have struck out both the one and the other. But the Papal Party foresaw this well, and opposed it with all the Artifice imaginable: and *Lainex* the Jesuit, did at large discourse against it; and they carried it so, that it was not permitted to be declared of *divine Right*. And by this, judg if it be likely that the Papacy owes its rise to *Episcopacy*, since the declaring it to be of *divine Right*, was judged one of the greatest blows the Papal Dominion could have received, as the abusing of the *Episcopal* authority, was the greatest step to its Exaltation.

Isot. Be in these things what may be, I am sure *from the beginning it was not so*, since Christ did so expressly prohibit all dominion and authority among his Disciples, when he said, *But it shall not be so among you: but whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister*, Luke 22. 26. Whereby he did not only condemn a tyrannical domination, but simply all Authority, like that the *Lords of the Gentiles exercised over them*. See page 88.

Crit. I confess, the advantages some have drawn from these words of *CHRIST*, for deciding this question, have many times appeared strange to me, their purpose being so

vitibly

visibly different from that to which they are applied. But if we examine the occasion that drew these words from *CHRIST*, it will furnish us with a key for understanding them aright: and that was the frequent contentions were among the Disciples about the precedency in the Kingdom of *CHRIST*: for they were in the vulgar *Judaical Error*, who believed the *Messiah* was to be a temporal Prince, and so understood all the pompous promises of the *New Dispensation* liberally, and thought that *CHRIST* should have restored *Israel* in the literal meaning: therefore they began to contend who should be preferred in his Kingdom: and the Wife of *Zebedee* did early bespeak the chief preferments for her Sons. Yea, we find them sticking to this mistake even at *CHRIST*'s Ascension, by the question then moved, concerning *his restoring the Kingdom at that time to Israel*. Now these Contentions, as they sprung from an error of their judgments, so also they took their rise from their proud ambition. And for a check to both, our Saviour answers them, by telling the difference was to be betwixt his Kingdom, and the Kingdoms of the Nations: these being exercised by Grandeur and temporal Authority, whereas his Kingdom was Spiritual, and allowed nothing of that; since Churchmen have not by *CHRIST* a Lordly or

Despotick dominion over Christians committed to them, but a paternal and brotherly one; by which in commanding, they serve their Flock; so that it is both a *Ministry* and an *Authority*. Therefore the words of Christ, *it shall not be so among you*, relate nothing to the degrees or ranks of Churchmen, but to the nature of their power and jurisdiction over their flock, and not to their degrees among themselves, which appears evidently from the whole contexture of the words. And that he is not speaking of any equality among Churchmen in their Church power, appears from the mention is made of the *greatest*, and *the chief*; *He that is greatest among you, let him be as the younger; and he that is chief, as he that doth serve*: which shew he was not here designed to strike out the degrees of superiority, when he makes express mention of them; but to intimate that the higher the degrees of *Ecclesiastical Offices* did raise them, they were thereby obliged to the more humility, and the greater labor. All which is evidently confirmed by the instance he gives of himself, which shews still he is not meaning of Church power (since he had certainly the highest *Ecclesiastical authority*) but only of Civil dominion; nothing of which he would assume. And if this place be to be applied to Church power, then it will rather prove too much, that there should be no
power

power at all among Churchmen over other Christians: For since the parallel runs betwixt the Disciples, and the Lords of the *Gentiles*; it will run thus, that tho the Lords of the *Gentiles* bear rule over their people, yet you must not over yours: so that this must either be restricted to *Civil Authority*, or else it will quite strike out all *Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction*. But how this should be brought to prove that there may not be several ranks in Church Offices, I cannot yet imagine. And as it is not thought contrary to this, that a Minister is over your Lay-Elders and Deacons, why should it be more contrary to it, that a rank of Bishops be over Ministers? In a word, since we find the Apostles exercising this paternal authority over other Churchmen, it will clearly follow they understood not *Christ*, as hereby meaning to discharge the several ranks of Churchmen, with different degrees of power. But to tell you plainly what by these words of *CHRIST* is clearly forbidden, I acknowledg that chiefly the Pope's pretence to the *Temporal Dominion* over Christendom, whether directly or indirectly, as the Vicar of *CHRIST*, is expressly condemned. Next, all Churchmen under what notion, or in what Judicatory soever, are condemned, who study upon a pretence of the Churches intrinick power, to possess themselves of the authority, to determine about

about obedience due to Kings or Parliaments and who bring a tyranny on the Christians; and procure what by Arts, what by Power, the secular Arm to serve at their beck. Whether this was the practice of the late *General Assemblies*, or not, I leave it to all who are so old, as to remember how squares went then; and if the leading Men at that time, had not really the secular power ready to lacquay at their commands, so that they ruled in the *spirit of the Lords of the Gentiles*, whatever they might have pretended. And the following change of Government did fully prove, that the obedience which was universally given to their commands, was only an appendage of the Civil Power, which was then directed by them: For no sooner was the power invaded by the *Usurper*, who regarded their Judicatories little, but the Obedience payed to their Decrees evanished. Thus, I say, these who build all their pretences to parity on their mistakes of these words, did most signally despise and neglect them in their true and real meaning. Now think not to retort this on any additions of *Secular Power*, which the munificence of Princes may have annexed to the *Episcopal Office*; for that is not at all condemned here: *CHRIST* speaking only of the power Churchmen, as such, derived from him their Head, which only bars all pretensions to *Civil Power*

Power on the title of their Functions; but doth not say that their Functions render them incapable of receiving any *Secular Power*, by a secular conveyance from the *Civil Magistrate*. And so far have I considered this great and pompous argument against precedency in the Church; and am mistaken if I have not satisfied you of the slender foundations it is built upon: all which is also applicable to St. *Peter's* words, of not *Lording it over their flocks*.

Isot. You are much mistaken, if you think that to be the great foundation of our belief of a parity among Churchmen, for I will give you another, (*page 91.*) which is this, that *JESUS CHRIST* the head of his Church, did institute a settled Ministry in his Church, to feed and over-see the Flock, to preach, to reprove, to bind, loose, &c. It is true, he gave the Apostles many singular things beyond their Successors, which were necessary for that time, and work, and were to expire with it: But as to their Ministerial Power which was to continue, he made all equal. The Apostles also acknowledged the Pastors of the Churches, their fellow-laborers, and Brethren. And the feeding and overseeing the Flock, are duties so complicated together, that it is evident none can be fitted for the one, without they have also authority for the other. And therefore all who have

have a power to preach, must also have a right to govern, since Discipline is referable to preaching, as a mean to its end : preaching being the great end of the Ministry. These therefore who are sent upon that work, must not be limited in the other : neither do we ever find *CHRIST* instituting a Superiour Order over preaching *Presbyters*, which shews he judged it not necessary : And no more did the Apostles, though they with-held none of the Counsel of *GOD* from the flock. Therefore this Superior Order usurping the power from the preaching Elders, since it hath neither warrant, nor institution in Scripture, is to be rejected, as an invasion of the rights of the Church. In fine, the great advantage our Plea for parity hath, is, that it proves its self, till you prove a disparity. For since you acknowledg it to be of *divine Right*, that there be Officers in the House of *G O D*, except you prove the institution of several Orders, an equality among them must be concluded. And upon these accounts it is that we cannot acknowledg the lawfulness of Prelacy.

Phil. I am sure, if your Friends had now heard you, they would for ever absolve you from designing to betray their cause by a faint Patrociny ; since you have in a few words laid out all their Forces : but if you call to mind what
hath

hath been already said, you will find most of what you have now pleaded, to be answered beforehand. For I acknowledge *Bishop* and *Presbyter*, to be one and the same Office; and so I plead for no new Office-Bearers in the Church. Next, in our *second Conference*, the power given to Churchmen was proved to be double. The first branch of it, is their Authority to publish the Gospel, to manage the Worship, and to dispense the Sacraments. And this is all that is of *divine right* in the Ministry, in which *Bishops* and *Presbyters* are equal sharers, both being vested with this power. But beside this, the Church claims a power of Jurisdiction, of making rules for discipline, and of applying and executing the same; all which is indeed suitable to the common Laws of *Societies*, and to the general rules of Scripture, but hath no positive warrant from any Scripture precept. And all these Constitutions of Churches into Synods, and the Canons of discipline, taking their rise from the divisions of the World into the several Provinces, and beginning in the end of the second, and beginning of the third *Century*, do clearly shew they can be derived from no divine Original; and so were, as to their particular form, but of humane Constitution: therefore as to the management of this Jurisdiction, it is in the Churches power to cast it in what mould
the

she will : and if so, then the constant practice of
 the Church for so many ages should determine
 us, unless we will pretend to understand the
 exigencies and conveniences of it better than
 they who were nearest the Apostolical time.
 But we ought to be much more determined by
 the *Laws of the Land*, which in all such matters
 have a power to bind our consciences to their
 obedience, till we prove the matter of them sin-
 ful. Now discover where the guilt lyes of fix-
 ing one over a Tract of ground, who shall have
 the chief inspection of the *Ministry*, and the
 greatest Authority in matters of Jurisdiction, so
 that all within that Precinct be governed by
 him, with the concurring votes of the other
Presbyters : if you say, that thereby the Mini-
 sters may be restrained of many things, which
 otherwise the good of the Church requires to
 be done : I answer, these are either things ne-
 cessary to be done by divine precept, or not : if
 the former, then since no power on earth can
 cancel the Authority of the *divine Law*, such
 restraints are not to be considered. But if the
 things be not necessary, then the Unity and
 Peace of the Church is certainly preferable to
 them. I acknowledge a *Bishop* may be tyran-
 nical, and become a great burden to his *Presby-*
ters ; but, pray, may not the same be apprehend-
 ed from Synods ? And remember your friends,

how

how long it is, since they made the same complaints against the Synods : and the hazard of an ill Bishop is neither so fixed, nor so lasting, as that of a bad Synod. For a Bishop may die, and a good one succeed : but when a Synod is corrupt, they who are the major part, are careful to bring in none, but such as are sure to their way ; whereby they propagate their corruption more infallibly than a Bishop can do. And what if the Lay ruling Elders should bend up the same plea against the Ministers, who do either assume *a Negative* over them directly, or at least do what is equivalent, and carry every thing to the *Presbytery, Synod, or General Assembly*, where they are sure to carry it against the Lay-Elders, they being both more in number, and more able with their learning and eloquence to confound the others ? But should a Lay-Elder plead thus against them, *We are Office-Bearers instituted by CHRIST, for ruling the flock, as well as you, and yet you take our power from us ; for whereas in our Church Sessions, which are of CHRIST's appointment, we are the greater number, being generally twelve to one ; you Ministers have got a device, to turn us out of the power : for you allow but one of us to come to your Synods, and Presbyteries, and but one of a whole Presbytery to go to a National Synod ; whereby you strike the rest of us out of our power : and thus you assert a preeminence*

nence over us, to carry matters as you please? Now *Isotimus*, when in your principles you answer this, I will undertake on all hazards to satisfy all you can say, even in your own principles. Next, may not one of the Congregational way, talk at the same rate, and say, *C H R I S T* hath given his Office-Bearers full power to preach, feed, and oversee the flock; and yet for all that, their power of overseeing is taken from them; and put in the hands of a multitude, who being generally corrupt themselves, and lusting to envy, will suffer none to outstrip them: but are tyrannical over any they see minding the work of the Gospel more than themselves? And must this usurpation be endured and submitted to? And let me ask you freely, what imaginable device will be fallen upon, for securing the Church from the tyranny of Synods, unless it be either by the Magistrates power, or by selecting some eminent Churchmen, who shall have some degrees of power beyond their brethren? In a word, I deny not, but as in *Civil Governments*, there is no form upon which great inconveniences may not follow; so the same is unavoidable in *Ecclesiastical Government*. But as you will not deny, Monarchy to be the best of Governments, for all the hazards of tyranny from it; so I must crave leave to have the same impressions of *Episcopacy*.

Crit. But suffer me to add a little for checking
ing

king *Isotimus* his too positive asserting of parity from the *New Testament*; for except he find a precept for it, his Negative Authority will never conclude it: and can only prove a parity lawful, and that imparity is not necessary. I shall acknowledge that without Scripture warrants, no new Offices may be instituted; but without that, in order to Peace, Unity, Decency, and Edification, several ranks and dignities in the same Office, might well have been introduced: whereby some were to be empowered either by the Churches choice, or the Kings Authority, as Overseers, or inspectors of the rest: who might be able to restrain them in the exercise of some parts of their functions, which are not immediatly commanded by *G O D*. And you can never prove it unlawful, that any should oversee, direct, and govern Churchmen, without you prove the Apostolical function unlawful: for what is unlawful, and contrary to the rules of the Gospel, can upon no occasion, and at no time become lawful: since then both the Apostles, and the Evangelists exercised Authority over *Presbyters*; it cannot be contrary to the Gospel rules, that some should do it. To pretend that this superiority was for that exigent, and to die with that age, is a mere allegation without ground from Scripture: for if by our *L O R D*'s words, it

shall not be so among you, all superiority among Churchmen was forbid, how will you clear the Apostles from being the first transgressors of it? And further, if upon that exigent such superiority was lawful, then upon a great exigent of the Church, a superiority may be still lawful. Besides, it is asserted, not proved, that such an authority as *S. Paul* left with *Timothy* and *Titus*, was to die with that age: for where the reason of an appointment continues, it will follow, that the Law should also be coeval with the ground on which it was first enacted: if then there be a necessity that Churchmen be kept in order, as well as other Christians; and if the more exalted their office be, they become the more subject to corruption, and corruptions among them be both more visible, and more dangerous than they are in other persons; the same parity of reason that enjoyns a Jurisdiction to be granted to Churchmen over the faithful, will likewise determine the fitness of granting some excreſcing power to the more venerable and approved of the Clergy over others; neither is this a new Office in the House of G O D, but an eminent rank of the same Office.

Isot. You study to present *Episcopacy* in as harmless a posture as can be, yet that it is a distinct Office, is apparent by the sole claim of
Ordi-

Ordination and Jurisdiction they pretend to, and by their consecration to it, which shews they account it a second Order: besides, that they do in all things carry as these who conceit themselves in a Region above the *Presbyters*.

Phil. I am not to vindicate neither all the practices, nor all the pretensions of some who have asserted this Order, no more than you will do the opinions or actings of all your party: which when you undertake, then I allow you to charge me with what you will. But it is a different thing to say, that no Ordination, nor greater act of Jurisdiction, should pass without the Bishop's consent, or concurrence (which is all I shall pretend to, and is certainly most necessary for preserving of Order and Peace) from asserting that the sole power for these stands in the Bishops person. And though I do hold it schismatical to ordain without a Bishop, where he may be had, yet I am not to annul these Ordinations that pass from *Presbyters*, where no *Bishop* can be had: and this lays no claim to a new Office, but only to a higher degree of inspection in the same Office; whereby the exercise of some acts of *Jurisdiction* are restrained to such a method; and this may be done either by the Churches free consent, or by the King's authority. As for the consecration of *Bishops* by a new imposition of hands, it doth not prove them

them a distinct Office: being only a solemn benediction and separation of them for the discharge of that inspection committed to them: and so we find *Paul* and *Barnabas* (though before that they preached the Gospel, yet when they were sent on a particular Commission to preach to the gentiles) were blessed with imposition of hands, *Acts* 13. 3. which was the usual Ceremony of benediction. Therefore you have no reason to quarrel this, unless you apprehend their managing this oversight the worse, that they are blessed in order to it: nor can you quarrel the Office in the *Liturgy*, if you do not think they will manage their power the worse, if they receive a new effusion of the holy Ghost. And thus you see, how little ground there is, for quarrelling *Episcopacy* upon such pretences.

Eud. I am truly glad you have said so much for confirming me in my kindness for that Government: for if you evinces its lawfulness, I am sure the expediency of that Constitution will not be difficult to be proved, both for the tryal of Entrants, and the oversight of these in Office: for when any thing lyes in the hands of a multitude, we have ground enough to apprehend what the issue of it will prove. And what sorry overly things these tryals of Entrants are, all know. How little pains is taken to form their
minds

minds into a right sense of that function, to which they are to be initiated at one step, without either previous degree, or mature tryal? And here I must say, the ruine of the Church springs hence, that the passage to sacred Offices lyes so patent, whereby every one leaps into them out of a secular life, having all the train of his vanities, passions, and carnal designs about him: and most part entering thus unpurified, and unprepared, what is to be expected from them, but that they become idle, vain and licentious, or proud, ambitious, popular and covetous? I confess, things among us are not come to any such settlement, as might give a provision against this: But devise me one like a *Bishop's Authority*, who shall not confer Orders to any, before either himself, or some other select and excellent persons, on whom he may with confidence devolve that trust, be well satisfied not only about the learning and abilities, but about the temper, the piety, the humility, the gravity, and discretion of such as pretend to holy Orders: And that some longer tryal be taken of them by the *probationership* of some previous degree. Indeed the poverty of the Church, which is not able to maintain Seminaries and Colledges of such *Probationers*, renders this design almost impracticable. But stretch your thoughts as far as your invention can send

them, and see if you can provide such an expedient for the reforming of so visible an abuse, as were the Bishop's plenary authority to decide in this matter. For if it lie in the hands of a Plurality, the major part of these, as of all mankind, being acted by lower measures, the considerations of Kinred, alliance, friendship, or powerful recommendations, will always carry through persons, be they what they will, as to their abilities and other qualifications: And a multitude of Churchmen is less concerned in the shame can follow an unworthy promotion; which every individual of such a company will be ready to bear off himself, and fasten on the Plurality. But if there were one to whom this were peculiarly committed, who had authority to stop it, till he were clearly convinced that the person to be ordained, was one from whose labors good might be expected to the Church, he could act more roundly in the matter: and it may be presupposed that his condition setting him above these low considerations, to which the inferiour Clergy are more obnoxious, he would manage it with more caution; as knowing that both before GOD and Man, he must bear the blame of any unworthy promotion.

And as for these in Office, can any thing be more rational than that the inspection into their labors, their deportment, their conversation, and their

their dexterity in Preaching and Catechising, be not done mutually by themselves in a parity, wherein it is to be imagined, that as they degenerate, they will be very gentle to one another? And when any inspection is managed by an equal, it opens a door to faction, envy, and emulation: neither are the private rebukes of an equal, so well received, nor will it be easie for one of a modest temper to admonish his fellow-Presbyter freely. And yet how many things are there, of which Churchmen have need to be admonished, in the discharge of all the parts of their function, especially when they set out first, being often equally void of experience and discretion? But what a remedy for all this, may be expected from an excellent Bishop: who shall either, if his health and strength allow it, be making excursions through his Diocese, and himself observe the temper, the labors, and conversation of his Clergy? or at least trust this to such as he hath reason to confide most in, that so he may understand what admonitions, directions, and reproofs are to be given, which might obviate a great many indiscretions, and scandals that flow from Churchmen. And the authority of such a person, as it would more recommend the reproofs to these for whom they were meant, so it could prevail to make them effectual, by a following Censure if

neglected. If the confusion some keep matters in, have hindered us for coming at a desired settlement, the Office of Episcopacy is not to be blamed, whose native tendency I have laid out before you, and in a fair *idea*, but in what was both the rule and practice of the ancient Church, and wants not latter instances for verifying it. In a word, I must tell you, I am so far from apprehending danger to the Church, from Bishops having too much power, that I shall fear rather its slow recovery, because they have too little: which might be managed with all the meekness and humility imaginable, and indeed ought to be always accompanied with the advice and concurrence of the worthiest persons among the inferior Clergy. But till you secure my fears of the greater part in all Societies becoming corrupt, I shall not say by the *major part* of them, but by the *better part*.

Isot. I see you run a high strain, and far different from what was the discourse of this Countrey a year ago, of an accommodation was intended, wherein large offers seemed to be made: but I now see by your ingenuous freedom, that though for a while you (who were called a great friend to that design) were willing to yield up some parts of the Episcopal Grandeur, yet you retain the root of that Lordly ambition still in your heart; and so though for
some

some particular ends, either to deceive, or divide the LORDS people, you were willing to make an appearance of yielding; yet it was with a resolution of returning with the first opportunity, to the old practices and designs of the Prelats, of enhancing the Ecclesiastical Power to themselves, and a few of their associates. And this lets me see, what reason all honest people have to bless GOD that these arts and devices took not; *for an Ethiopian cannot change his skin.*

Phil. I confess to you freely, I was as little satisfied with these condescensions as any of you; and though they gave up the Rights of the Church to a peevish and perverse party, whom gentleness will never gain: and therefore am no less satisfied than you are, that they did not take: and so much the more, that their refusing to accept of so large offers, gave a new and clear character to the World of their temper: and that it is a faction, and the servile courting of a party which they design, and not a strict adherence to the rules of conscience, otherwise they had been more tractable.

Eud. Let me crave pardon to curb your humor a little, which seems too near a kin to *Iso-timus* his temper, though under a different character. For my part, I had then the same sense of Episcopacy which I have just now owned. But when I considered the ruins of Religion

ligion, which our divisions occasioned among us; and when I read the large offers *S. Augustin* made on the like occasion to the *Donatists*, I judged all possible attempts even with the largest condescensions for an accommodation, a worthy and pious design, well becoming the gravity and moderation of a Bishop to offer, and the nobleness of these in authority to second with their warmest endeavors: for if it was blessed with success, the effect was great, even the settling of a broken and divided corner of the Church: if it took not, as it fully exonerated the Church of the evils of the Schism; so it rendered the enemies of Peace and Unity the more unexcusable. Only I must say this upon my knowledg, that whatever designs men of various sentiments fastened upon that attempt, it was managed with as much ingenuity and sincerity, as mortals could carry along with them in any purpose. I know it is expected and desired that a full account of all the steps of that affair be made publick, which a friend of ours drew up all along, with the progress of it. But at present my concern in one, whom a late Pamphlet, (as full of falshoods in matters of fact, as of weakness in point of reason) hath misrepresented (*the case of Accommodation, Page 31*) shall prevail with me to give an account of a particular passed in a Conference, which a Bishop
and

and two Presbyters had with about thirty of the *Nonconformists*, at *Pasley*, on the 14th of *December* in the year 1670. When the Bishop had in a long Discourse recommended Unity and Peace to them, on the terms were offered; he withal said much to the advantage of Episcopacy as he stated it, from the rules and practices of the ancient Church: offering to turn their Proselyte immediately, if they should give him either clear Scripture, good reason or warrant from the most Primitive Antiquity against such Episcopacy. And with other things, he desired to know whether they would have joined in Communion with the Church, at the time of the Council of *Nice*, (to carry them no higher) or not? for if they refused that, he added he would have less heartiness to desire communion with them, since of these he might say, *Let my soul be with theirs*. But to that, a general answer was made by one, who said, He hoped they were not looked upon, as either so weak, or so wilful, as to determine in so great a matter, but upon good grounds: which were the same, that the asserters of Presbyterian Government had built on, which they judged to be conform both to Scripture and Primitive Antiquity. But for Scripture, neither he nor any of the meeting offered to bring a Title: only he alledged some differences betwixt the ancient Presidents, as he
called

called them, and our Bishops. But this was more fully enlarged by one who is believed to be among the most learned of the Party: whose words with the answer given them, I shall read to you, as I take both from a Journal was drawn of that affair, by one whose exactness and fidelity in it, can be attested by some worthy spectators, who read what he wrote after the Meeting was ended, and Judged it not only faithful, but often verbal: And that he was so careful to evite the appearances of partiality, that he seemed rather studious to be more copious in proposing what was said by these who differed from his opinion, whereas he contracted much of what was said by these he favored. The account follows.

Mr. ——— said, That he offered to make appear, the difference was betwixt the present Episcopacy, and what was in the ancient Church, in five particulars. The first was, that they had no Archbishops in the Primitive Church. It is true, they had Metropolitans; but in a Council of Carthage, it was decreed, that no Bishop should be called Summus Sacerdos, or Princeps Sacerdotum, sed primæ sedis Episcopus. 2. The Bishops in the ancient Church were Parochial, and not only κατὰ πόλιν, but in every Village κατὰ κώμην; for even in Bethany we find there was a Bishop. 3. Two Bishops might be in one Church, such was (not to mention
Alexan-

Alexander and Narcissus at Jerusalem) Augustin, who with Valerius, was ordained Bishop of Hippo. 4. Bishops were elected by their Presbyters, so Jerome tells us, that in Alexandria the Presbyters choosed one of their number to be Bishop: and finally, the Bishops were countable to and censurable by their Presbyters: for either this must have been, otherwise they could not have been censured at all. For though we meet with some Provincial Synods in Church History, as that of Carthage in Cyprians time, for the rebaptizing of hereticks; and that at Antioch against Samosatenus, yet these instances were rare, and recurred seldom; therefore there must have been a power in Presbyters to have censured their Bishops, otherwise it could not have been done, which is absurd to imagine. And upon all these accounts, he judged the present Episcopacy differed much from the ancient *oecumēnia*.

Upon this discourse, the Bishop being weary of speaking much, looked to one of his Presbyters, whom that Pamphlet in derision, calls, a worthy Doctor: who said, He found the ancient writings were so clear for a disparity among Churchmen, and so full of it, that he was assured none could doubt it, after he had looked but overly upon them: But as to what was alledged, he first assumed the five particulars, and spoke to them in order. To the first, he said, It was true, the term Archbishop, was not used in the first Centuries: but in the Council of Nice,

Nice, mention is not only made of Metropolitans ; but the Canon saith of them, τὸ ἀρχαῖα ἐν περὶ τοῦ, let the ancient customs have their force : which shews the superiority of Metropolitans to have been pretty early begun. And the Canon that was cited, calling him, Primæ Sedis Episcopum, makes him Primate : now we are not to contend about words, when the thing is clear : neither will any Archbishop judg himself injured, if instead of that name, he be called Metropolitan, or Primate. Besides, Archiepiscopus, doth not import Prince of the Bishops ; but that he is the chief and first of them. And this prefixing of ἀρχ to ἐπίσκοπος, was not so odious : for Nazianzen calls a Bishop ἀρχιεπῖς, and the Areopagite ἱερεπῖς.

For the second particular, it is true, Bishops were in many places very thick set ; for in S. Augustin's time it appears from the journals of a Conference he had with the Donatists, that there were about 500. Bishopricks in a small tract of ground, but this was not universal : for Theodoret tells he had 800. Parishes in his Diocese : and Sozomen tells of great Countries where there were very few Bishops. And to prove this, the Canons of Ancyra make a difference betwixt the Presbyters of the Country from those of the City : and over the former there was a Chorepiscopus ; which shews that the whole Diocese was not within the City. But this was not much to our purpose, since the more or the less did not vary

vary the kind. *And if a Bishop might be over the Ministers of the City, it cannot be unlawful that he be likewise set over more in the Country: which can be no more essential to this matter, than it is, whether a Parish be great or small. So that this difference may well make the one unexpedient, but unlawful it cannot be, if the other be lawful.*

For the third particular, there was a Canon of the Council of Nice, that there might be but one Bishop in a City. And he was amazed to hear the instance of S. Augustin alledged, who was indeed ordained Coadjutor to Valerius; but himself in his 110. Epist. condemns that, telling that he did it ignorantly, not knowing it to be contrary to the Nicene Rules: And therefore he tells how he designed Eradius to be his Successor, but would not ordain him in his own time, because of that Canon. Other instances of more Bishops in one City, might have been more pertinently adduced to this purpose: but they were either Coadjutors, such as Nazianzen the son was to his father, or it was agreed to for settling a Schism, as was done in the Schism betwixt Meletius and Paulinus of Antioch. And so S. Augustin and the African Bishops with him, offered to the Donatists, that would they agree with them, these schismatical Bishops should be continued as conjunct Bishops with those already settled in those Sees where they lived. It is true, some will have both Linus and Clemens to have succeeded S. Peter at Rome, and Evodius and Ignatius to have

have succeeded him at Antioch: But for this, none assert that both succeeded to S. Peter; some being for one, and some for another: and so in a historical matter, the testimonies of these who lived nearest that time should decide the question. But the Constitutions of Clemens offer a solution to this, that at first there were in some Cities two Churches, one for those of the Circumcision, and another for those of the Uncircumcision: and after the destruction of Jerusalem, this distinction was swallowed up. This is rational, and not without ground in Scripture. besides, that that Book, though none of Clements, yet is ancient. And from all this it was clear, that there might be but one Bishop in a City.

As for the fourth particular, it is true, the ancient elections of Bishops and Presbyters were partly by Synods, partly by Presbyters, and partly popular. But as none would say it made any essential alteration of the Constitution of a Church, if instead of these elections, Patrons had now a right of presenting to Churches; so though instead of these elections the King were Patron of all the Bishopricks, it did not alter the nature of Episcopacy, much less justify a Schism against it. But beside this, it was known the Capitular elections were still continued.

And for the fifth particular, he desired they might give one instance in all Antiquity, where a Bishop was censured by Presbyters: it being clear that they could finish nothing without the Bishops sentence, under

ἐπιτελείωσαν ἀνευ γνώμης ἐπισκόπων, was the words of the Canon: And if they could finish nothing without the Bishop, much less could they censure himself. Provincial Synods were begun in the second Century, which appears from many Synods were held about the day of observing Easter. Another expedient they had, when a Bishop was heretical, that the neighboring Bishops used to publish it in their Circular Letters, which went around, and so they did excommunicate or depose them. But the regular way of procedure against Bishops was in Provincial Synods, which were now offered to be set up. Yet even this exception could be no ground for separating, no more than in their principles Lay Elders had to separate from their Ministers, who were their fixed President, and yet did not judge themselves censurable by these Lay Elders; tho' as to the power of ruling, they held them to be equal. With this he ended, saying, He had now proposed what occurred of a sudden to his thoughts on these heads, though he believed much more might be adduced; but he supposed there was enough said to clear these particulars. And it seems the Person who had engaged him to this, judged so; since neither he, nor any of his brethren, offered a reply. And by this account (of the truth whereof I am willing all there present bear witness) let the company judge of the ingenuity of these Writers. But I shall pursue the discourse of the accommodation no further.

Basil. I am sure it hath left this conviction on all our Consciences, that that Party is obstinately fixed to their own humors, without the least color of reason. But now, I think, enough is said for justifying both the lawfulness and usefulness of Episcopacy, and that there is nothing in it contrary either to the nature or rules of the Gospel, or of right Reason. And for any occasional evils may have risen from the restitution of this Government, they are with no justice to be fastened on it. I know, many accuse their revenues and honors, thus *the spirit that is in us lusteth to envy*: and the eyes of many are evil, because the eyes of our pious Progenitors were good. But indeed the ravenous Appetites of some *Ostriches* among us, have swallowed down so much of the Churches Patrimony, that what remains of it, can scarce provoke envy. And truly Churchmen bestowing their Revenues well, for Alms-deeds, relieving the Widows and Orphans, and such modest hospitality and decency, as may preserve them from the disesteem of the vulgar, who measure their value of men much from these externals, there were no ground of quarrelling at them were their riches seven-fold increased. I am far from the thoughts of patronizing the *German* Bishops, on whom I look as the disgrace of that Order, who live in all things like other Princes, making Wars, and
leading

leading out Armies: nor do they once consider their Dioceses, or what they owe them as Bishops, being wholly immersed in secular affairs. But for all this, I cannot see cause for blaming Churchmen, their being either upon the publick Councils of the Kingdom in Parliaments, or on His Majesties Secret Councils, and that both because Ecclesiastical matters are often in agitation, both in the one, and the other, in which none are so properly to be advised with as Churchmen. Occasion may also be frequently given to those who should be presupposed to understand the rules of equity and conscience best, to lay them before others, who either know them not, or mind them too little: And finally, they are Subjects, as well as others, and by the clearness is to be expected in their Judgments, and the calmness of their minds, together with their abstracted and contemplative manner of life, they may upon occasions be very prudent Counsellors: And why a Prince shall be deprived of the Councils of that which should be the wisest and best part of his Kingdom, no reason can be given. But for all this, I acknowledge there is great hazard from humane Infirmary, lest by such meddling they be too much intangled in matters extrinsick to them, whereby their thoughts may be drawn out from that inward, serene, and abstracted temper

wherein their minds should be preserved; both for more spiritual Contemplation, and for a more close pursuing the work of the Gospel, which ought still to be their chief labor. But I must touch this string no more, lest you say that *the Fox preacheth*, and methinks our discourse is now near its period.

Isot. A great many things do yet remain which are untouched, and deserve to be better considered: for these crude Dialogues poured out a great deal of stuff, which it is like the writer never examined: And in these, you who are his friends, must either vindicate him, or leave him to the mercy of every severe censurer.

Eud. His temper is well enough known to us, that he is very little solicitous about the esteem or censures of men: and therefore, if all the particulars in his Book, cannot maintain themselves to the judgments of rational and unprepossessed Readers, he thinks them not worthy of his Patrociny. And for that little trifling way of writing, by tracing every word in a Book, or of making good all a man hath said, it is a task equally mean, unpleasant, and laborious: and looks like one contending for victory more than truth. Were it a worthy thing for us to go and reckon how often *and* comes about in any of that Pamphleteers long periods, or how often he writes false Grammar,

how

how harsh his Phrases, and how tedious his Periods are? or make other such like remarks: Alas, did we that, there were no end! and yet such like are many of his reflections. But then how beautiful were our discourse, if interwoven with those elegancies of *poor wretch, babler, impertinent, confident, ignorant, atheist, scoffer,* and many more of that same strain? I know well enough why he used those, his design being to make his gentle and simple *Readers* stand gravely, and turn up the white, and look pale, and affrighted with all those black Imputations he charges on that *poor wretch*. Methinks I hear the censures of the herd, when they first read over his Book, to this purpose: *Oh, here is a worthy piece, full of deep learning; and believe me, he speaks home: he is a sweet man that wrote it, be he who he will, and was marvellously born through in it all. And oh, but it is seasonable! and well timed: for he hath answered the whole Book to a word. And where we thought it strongest, he shews its weakness most. But I wish the poor wretch repentance, yet it is a proud Companion, and full of disdain; but I hope he is humbled for once: it were a pity of him, for they say he hath some abilities: but they are all wrong set: and he will, may be, study to heal the beast of the wound, which one of our Champions hath given it; but had he any sparks of grace, I could yet love him for his good ——— sake.*

It were a worthy attempt to go and satisfy such a gang of Cattle : therefore the cavils on the fifth and sixth Dialogue are so poor, that it were lost time to consider them ; and so groundless, that he who from reading over the Dialogues themselves, is not able to withstand all those tricks of Sophistry, would be little bettered by all we could add : and therefore we may well quit the Theme, and that the rather, that we have examined all that is of publick concern in these debates : and for any thing that was started, which lies out of the way, we will leave the discussing of these to the Conformist himself ; since our design in this *Conference* was to get mutual satisfaction to our Consciences, in these things which the Laws enjoin : and if we have gained this, we are to leave contending about other things, which relate not to us. Only if in these greater points it be found that what the Conformist said in the Dialogues, was grounded on so much clear and strong reason, as we have discovered since our first meeting ; it is to be presumed that in other things he was not so rash or irrational as to utter such absurdities or errors, as the late Pamphlets do charge upon him.

Phil. Our work was to consider, whether absolute subjection was due to the Civil Authority, and how far its dominion over our obedience did

did reach, and whether the Principles and Practices of the late times, had such evident characters of G O D's acceptance on them, that it was an unpardonable crime to reverse that building, which they prepared with so much noise, and cemented with so much blood; and by consequence whether Episcopacy was *that accursed thing* which provoked G O D's Jealousie so much against us, that it was unlawful to unite with it, or so far to comply with its adherents as to unite with them in Worship? If these things be made clear to us, we need not amuse our selves, nor entertain one another with farther janglings, and therefore may break off our Conference.

Isot. Since you will break off, I shall not struggle about it: for it is a confession of your weakness, that you pass over so many things with this slight silence,

Basil. This is the genuine Spirit of the party which you now express to the life; but when ever the Author of the Dialogues undergoes the penance of examining what you desire, it will perhaps appear, you have as little ground for this as for your other boasting. But I am sure no scruple sticks with me about these great heads we have examined, so that upon a narrow survey of these matters, it appears he had more reason for what he asserted, than he then vented:

And I have as little doubt of his being able to clear himself about other matters, which are snarled at by these Pamphlets. But one thing I have not forgot, about which I am more solicitous: which was a promise *Polyhistor* made of sending when our *Conference* were ended, an account of the model and forms of the ancient Government: which I desire with such earnestness, that I wish we were gone, that he might be as good as his word.

Poly. I know not if it shall answer your hopes, but your curiosity shall be quickly satisfied, after I have given you some account of my design in it. When I considered the ruines of Religion, and the decays of Piety through the World, I have often bent my thoughts to seek out the most proper remedies and means for the Churches recovery: and that which seemed the most promising, was to consider the constitution, the rites and forms of the Church in her first and purest ages; and to observe the steps of their declining from the primitive simplicity and purity, which being once fully done, great materials would be thereby congested for many useful thoughts, and overtures in order to a Reformation. And this is a work, which for all the accurate enquiries this age hath produced, is not yet performed to any degree of perfection, or ingenuity: therefore I resolved to pursue
this

this design as much as my leisure and other avocations could allow of. But as I was doubtful what method to follow in digesting my observations, the Canons vulgarly called Apostolical, offered themselves to my thoughts: I thereupon resolved to follow their tract, and to compile such hints as I could gather on my way for giving a clear view of the state of the Church in the first ages. As for the opinions of the ancient Fathers, these have been so copiously examined by the Writers of Controversies, that scarce any thing can be added to those who went before us: but few have been at such pains for searching into their practices, and rules for Discipline, and Worship, wherein their excellency and strength lay. In this inquiry I have now made good advances, but at present I will only send you my Observations on the two first Canons: and as you shall find this task hath succeeded with me, I will be encouraged to break it off, or to pursue it farther. Only on the way, let me tell you, that I am so far from thinking these Canons, Apostolical, that nothing can be more evident, than that they were a collection made in the *Third Century* at soonest: for the matter of almost every Canon discovers this when well examined, and therefore that Epistle of *Zephyrinus* the Pope, who lived about the year 200, that mentions 60 (or as others cite it

it 70.) of the Apostles sayings, is not to be consider'd: that Epistle with the other *Decretals*, being so manifestly spurious, that it cannot be doubted by any who reads them: and the number sixty agrees with no Edition; for they are either fifty or 85. *Tertullian* is also cited for them, but the words cited as his, are not in his Book *contra Praxeam*, from which they are vouched. Nor can they be called the work of *Clemens Romanus*, though they were vented under his name. For *Athanasius* in his *Synopsis*, reckons the work of *Clemens* Apocryphal. And *Eusebius* tells us that nothing ascribed to *Clement* was held genuine, but his Epistle to the *Corinthians*. But the first Publishers of these who lived, it is like in the Third Century, have called them Apostolical, as containing the earliest rules which the Apostolical men had introduced in the Church. And afterwards others to conciliate more veneration for them, called them the Canons of the Apostles, compiled by *Clement*. And this drew *Pope Gelasius's* censure on them, by which the Book of the Canons of the Apostles is declared Apocryphal: which some who assert their authority and antiquity, would foolishly evite, by applying that censure only to the 35. added Canons: whereas the censure is simply passed on the Book, and not on any additions to it. And this shall serve for an Introduction to the

Papers

Papers I will send you how soon I get home.

Phil. I doubt not but all of us, except *Isotimus*, will be very desirous to understand the particular forms of the Primitive Church: but he is so sure, that they will conclude against him, that I believe he is not very curious of any such discovery.

Isot. You are mistaken, for I doubt not, but much will be found among the Ancients for me; but if otherwise, I will lead you a step higher, to let you see that from the beginning it was not so: For Antiquity, when against Scripture, proves only the error ancient. And if you quit the Scriptures to us, we will yield those musty Records to you.

Eud. Pray, speak not so confidently, after all your pretences have been so baffled, that we are ashamed of you: for you are like the *Spaniard*, who retained his supercilious Looks and Gate, when he was set to beg. But I will not be rude in a place which owns me for its Master, though really your confidence extorts it.

Isot. You are a proud company, and so elevated in your own eyes, that you despise all who differ from you, and think you censure them gently, if you call them no worse than ignorants and fools. Is there any arrogance in the World like this?

Phil. Pray, let us not fall out, now that we
are

are to part : but I confess it is no wonder the smart of all the foils you have got, provoke some passion in you, and so I pity you ; for I know none of your Party who would have carried so discreetly. Therefore, Adieu, I must be gone, and leave this good company.

Isot. You will have the last word of scolding, but I perhaps will find out one that will be too hard for you all, and will call you to account of all you have both argued and boasted.

Basil. I will break off next, since the design of your meeting is finished : only, *Polyhistor*, mind your promise.

Poly. I go about it, and therefore, *Eudaimon*, I beg your pardon to be gone.

Eud. Though Retirement and Solitude be ever acceptable to me, yet it will not be without some pain that I return to it, when I miss so much good company, as have relieved me these four days : but the truth is, on the other hand, I am glad to see an end put to this painful Engagement of which I suppose we are all weary. It remains only that I return you my sincere and hearty thanks for the favor you have done me, which I wish I could do so warmly, as might engage you frequently to oblige me with the like civilities. Adieu, my good friends.

F I N I S :



Library of the Theological Seminary,

PRINCETON, N. J.

Division.....

Section.....

Number.....

Shelf.....

